

of the United States Department of Commerce's international trade-fair program in 1955.

Propaganda-wise Russians have announced a sputnik model will be operating in their exhibit. And in another move to show their scientific superiority, they will bring in "space dogs" used in rocket experiments.

Americans will base their exhibit, following the MIT plan, on a display showing how this Nation and its people are restless, dynamic, changing, and possessed of a tremendous creative and scientific talent.

At the moment, however, a tightfisted Congress threatens to dilute the effectiveness of the United States Brussels show.

A House Appropriation Subcommittee, under Brooklyn Democrat Representative JOHN J. ROONEY, has refused to appropriate \$2 million additional funds to the United States \$12.8 million fair budget.

Unless the extra funds are voted, fair officials say, the American pavilion and exhibits will shut down at 7 p. m. each day, while the neighboring Soviet exposition hall will operate until 10 p. m.

The darkened hall beside the Russian brightly lit building each night will put the United States in a tragic spot, publicity-conscious officials say.

Congressional parsimony, United States aids say, has been responsible for the prior cuts in the fair budget from a requested \$15 million to \$12.8 million.

FORTY-TWO NEW ENGLAND COMPANIES

Despite the shortage of funds at present, New Englanders will have a large part in projecting the picture of America.

James S. Plaut, former director of Boston's Institute of Contemporary Art, has charge of all cultural, architectural, and design details for the United States exhibit. Like Mrs. Howard, he is a deputy commissioner general.

The Boston institute, under Plaut's direction, has put together an exhibit of 150 objects from lawnmowers, plastic boats, and time clocks to land cameras.

Contributing to this exhibit and others in the United States pavilion and hall of international science, are 42 New England companies, including 22 from Massachusetts.

While the Brussels fair is not a trade show, these companies will contribute to industrial design exhibits to illustrate how the Nation lives.

Included among the industrial design exhibitors are Polaroid, Kendall, and Savage Arms from Massachusetts; United States Rubber and American Luggage from Rhode Island; Fuller Brush, Stanley Works, and Superior Electric from Connecticut.

In a crafts exhibit, 12 showings will be by New England artists. Six will come from New Hampshire and five from Connecticut.

Among the craft exhibitors will be James McKinnell, of Deerfield, a worker in stone-ware and enamels, and Robert J. King, of Newburyport, a silversmith. From New Hampshire will be Karl Brerut, of Thornton, an enamel worker.

New Englanders in the aggregate also have a role in the film America—the Land and the People, designed to show fair visitors how this Nation lives, works, and plays.

In a full-color wide-screen production the film will illustrate the region's colonial houses, tall elms, stone walls, old church spires—what the film writers call New England of Robert Frost and Edward MacDowell.

Another continuously running repeater film for European and visitors from the rest of the world will show Vermont farms, New England churchgoers; a Cape Cod saltbox house; Concord street scene in Cambridge and the Slade Spice factory in Boston.

In addition to cultural exhibits, there will be a number of scientific exhibits in which high voltage engineering and Sylvania Electric Products scientists will demonstrate

the scientific and engineering prowess of the United States.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

If not, morning business is closed.

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL RATES

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5836) to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates and for other purposes.

MR. MORSE obtained the floor.

MR. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me, in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

MR. MORSE. I yield.

MR. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAMMAGE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to strike out lines 15 through 25 on page 26 of the bill, and to renumber the following subsections. The clerk will read the language proposed to be stricken out.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

(2) The collection, transportation, and delivery of first-class mail is the primary function of the postal establishment. The cost of first-class mail shall be (A) the entire amount of the expenses allocated to first-class mail in the manner provided by this title plus (B) an amount determined to be the fair value of all extraordinary and preferential services, specially designed facilities, and other factors relating thereto. The costs of other classes of mail and special services (except the fourth-class mail) shall be computed on an incremental or "out of pocket" cost basis.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention particularly of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON], the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], and also the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who really raised this question, I think in an unanswerable form, last Wednesday.

MR. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. MORSE. I yield.

MR. CARLSON. If my colleague will recall, last evening I said if he would wait until this morning we would have more Senators present on the floor than we had last night.

MR. MORSE. I am sure the Senator can count. The Senator may have been right in his estimate, by a count of 1 or 2 Senators.

MR. PRESIDENT, I am disturbed about the entire section 103. I am not so sure that my amendment should not seek to strike the entire section. If in the course of the discussion today that seems to be deemed proper, I may ask for permission to perfect my amendment to that end.

I wish to speak first to the matter of policy, from a legislative standpoint, of including in legislation of this type a declaration of policy. I consider it surplusage; but, as surplusage so frequently is, it will be a great source of future trouble, I think, in the handling of postal legislation.

I believe that if this language is left in the bill, I have the right to ask the question, What is the purpose of leaving it in? The purpose must necessarily be, it seems to me, an attempt to exercise some influence in the future as to post office policy. There are so many questions raised by this language which will have to be applied to unforeseen conditions of the future that from the standpoint of the art of legislation I believe the language to be undesirable.

A suggestion was called to my attention by members of the press gallery who, I think, presented some unanswerable arguments against including the language which I seek to strike from the bill. They said, "You can be sure the magazine lobby would love to have the language remain in the bill," because it would place the magazine lobby in the position of saying in the future, "Ah, but the 85th Congress committed itself to a policy." We all know the precedential value of such an argument. Yes; it could be pointed out that the Senator from South Carolina said, in his colloquy with the Senator from Ohio, that we cannot bind future Congresses, and that future Congresses always have the right to adopt whatever ratemaking policy they desire. We all know that; but we also know what happens so often in the legislative process when someone can say, "But in 1958 the Congress of the United States said this shall be the Post Office policy, by way of a declaration of policy set forth in section 103 of the act of 1958."

MR. PRESIDENT, I speak to the general proposition first, namely, that from the standpoint of legislative art, this provision is very inartistic. It is not good legislative form. All of section 103 can be deleted from the bill, and not one iota of it will be changed. If that is not so, then what the Senator from South Carolina said last Wednesday afternoon falls to the ground.

The provision either is going to have some legislative binding effect or it is not. If it does have some legislative binding effect, then the chairman of the committee and those members of the committee supporting the provision had better stand up and tell us what the legislative binding effect is. If the provision does not have such an effect, then it is surplusage, or, as I said last night in debate, it is a stump speech written into the bill. I am against including in bills what might be considered stump speeches.

message concerning the military phase of the operation are impressive. Here he points out the effect American encouragement and contribution has had in inducing major self-help by other nations associated with the United States in free world defense. These, he declares, "have spent over five times as much as we have expended on military assistance."

Moreover, their cooperation has supplied forward bases for military purposes and has laid an essential industrial foundation for support of their own military forces. But outside the military area is the field of technical assistance and economic development to help governments meet the legitimate demand of peoples in less-developed countries for education and improved material standards of living. In this field, too, a tremendous volume of self-help is induced as local labor (and resources are added to a modicum of dollar investment).

But Americans cannot afford to look at the question of self-help entirely from one end of the program. Americans, too, are mightily helping themselves by the contributions they have made and in all likelihood will continue to make to the mutual security program. They are buying defense more economically through pooling of resources than any nation could buy it alone. They are creating markets for their products, opportunities for investment, and sources of raw materials. They are countering the attractions of Communist ideology by helping people to find they can defeat poverty without surrendering freedom.

The more successfully that is done, the less of a threat communism will become, until men can fix their attention not merely on security but on richer goals of human living. That will give a worldwide meaning to self-help.

[From the Boston Herald of February 21, 1958]

WE CAN AFFORD MUTUAL SECURITY

There may be good arguments against the President's mutual-security program. But the one Congress is paying most attention to at the moment makes no sense at all.

That is that foreign aid is too expensive a luxury so long as we face economic problems at home; in short, that we are too poor.

If, as the President says, mutual security is essential both to our military defense and to our success in the cold war, we can't afford not to spend the money.

"No one would seriously argue," he told Congress Wednesday, "that funds for our own military forces should be denied until desirable civilian projects had been provided for. Yet our expenditures for mutual security are fully as important to our national defense as expenditures for our own forces, and dollar for dollar buy us more in security."

In fact, we can afford the \$3.9 billion the President has asked for and much more if the situation demands it.

The Soviet Union awoke to the importance of foreign aid in the shakeup following Stalin's death. Since mid-1955 Russia and her satellites have spent an estimated \$1.9 billion on aid to less developed countries, of which only \$400 million was in arms aid. During this same period United States aid to the same group of countries totaled only \$1 billion, including \$100 million for arms aid.

Is the Soviet bloc so rich it can afford to rush in where we hold back? The figures do not support such a view.

The Soviet bloc has a combined national product of \$235 billion, increasing at a rate of 5 percent a year. But the United States alone, not counting its allies, has a national product of the order of \$400 billion, increasing at the rate of \$12 billion a year (3 percent).

The United States produces 523 million tons of coal a year to the U. S. S. R.'s 509 million. It pumps 2.5 billion barrels of oil to the Soviet's 685 million. Its steel production is 113 million tons to the Reds' 56 million. Its electric power production is 725 billion kilowatt-hours to their 210 billion.

We should not be complacent about our relative wealth, because the Communist countries are catching up fast. But we should be realistic. If the Reds can afford sputniks and missiles, and foreign aid, too, we can afford them. We have the resources to sustain whatever defense and foreign-policy measures our situation demands.

The President's foreign-aid program may be overgenerous (though this paper doesn't think so). The money might be spent more profitably somewhere else—on new roads or new schools or new flood-control projects (though the President's allocation makes sense to us). But the money is available. We can raise it if we want. Let no one say we can't.

[From the Boston Traveler of February 21, 1958]

INVESTING IN SECURITY

There's certain to be a fight in Congress when debate gets going on President Eisenhower's \$3.9-billion foreign-aid program.

Fortunately, though, some of the most influential leaders in both parties are behind the President on this one and are ready to battle for its survival.

They see the program for what it is—our most effective way of replying to the Soviet challenge in the overall cold war.

The Soviets would rather win world domination through economic warfare than through military combat. Economic warfare is less costly, less cumbersome, less apt to create international enmities, and less trouble to clean up after victory is won. Knowing this, the Soviets are pouring tremendous amounts of money and effort into a foreign-aid program of their own.

We must meet that challenge or accept the ugly alternatives mentioned by the President. These would include the dislocation of free-world power, the crumbling of our overseas positions, a new and massive boost in our defense budget, a big increase in draft calls, and eventually an island America in a sea of international communism.

It would cost us a lot more than \$3.9 billion to keep going under such handicaps. It would cost us also many of our cherished freedoms.

On the other hand, by accepting the fact that foreign aid means mutual security for our own and other free nations we would be placing the problem in its correct perspective.

Foreign aid is not a giveaway carnival. It is a carefully planned cooperative program whereby we work with other nations to strengthen our military and economic defenses.

It has worked successfully for 10 years. It has greatly diminished the Soviet threat. It's the best investment we can make toward free-world security.

NEW ENGLAND IN MAJOR ROLE IN WORLD FAIR AT BRUSSELS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article by Juan Cameron, entitled "New England in Major Role in World Fair at Brussels," which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald on February 23, 1958. It makes me very proud to realize that Massachusetts and her sister States in New England will be making a significant contribution to the

American exhibits at this important international event.

The only sour note in the article is mention of the fact that the United States exhibits will have to shut down 3 hours earlier each evening than the nearby Russian exposition unless Congress appropriates additional money for our country's fair budget. I hope my colleagues will agree with me that we should all endeavor to see to it that the American exhibit will not suffer in comparison with the Russian exhibit due to the Congress' failure to provide adequate funds.

The fair is to run from April to October, and is expected to attract 35 million visitors from all over the world, many millions of whom it can be expected do not have the opportunity to visit in this country. It would be a clear example of penny-wise pound-foolish economy for the American exhibits to be outdone by the Russian in the eyes of people who attend the fair.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ENGLAND IN MAJOR ROLE IN WORLD FAIR AT BRUSSELS

(By Juan Cameron)

From pavilion site to rooftop, United States exhibits at the Brussels World Fair, opening this spring, will bear a Yankee stamp.

A New Hampshire company, Kalwall Corp., built the plastic roof, 341 feet in diameter, that will crown the \$5 million United States pavilion. Built in Manchester, the roof was flown in sections to Belgium.

EXPECT 25 MILLION

The entire theme of the United States exhibit was plotted by a 15-man group drawn mainly from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

And United States grand hostess to the 25 million visitors expected to visit this country's exhibit will be Mrs. Charles P. Howard, of Reading. Mrs. Howard, wife of the former Massachusetts bank commissioner, left here recently to take up her duties in Brussels as United States deputy commissioner general to the international exposition.

The Brussels universal and international exposition in which more than 50 nations will participate is the first of its kind since the New York World Fair in 1939.

Staged on 500 acres of Heysel Park, near Brussels, the world fair will bring together the best of material and culture that nations from Chile to China have evolved in 2,000 years of civilization.

An estimated 35 million visitors will visit the Brussels fairgrounds between April and October to hear and watch the world's leading orchestras, opera singers, ballet dancers, and dramatic players.

MANY CULTURES

In addition the 50 nations will put on film festivals, folklore processions, plus exhibits of autos, hi-fi's, and clothes designed by the world's leading fashion designers.

Although planned to show the development of American, European, African, and Asiatic cultures, the fair will inevitably be a propaganda battleground between East and West.

Heightening this battle is the location of the 6½-acre United States exhibit site situated between that of the Soviet Union and the Holy See. This site was chosen by Roy F. Williams, Associated Industries of Massachusetts executive head, while he was head

Mr. President, I think this provision should be stricken from the bill. As I believe I have demonstrated many times, I am willing to make such progress as I can by way of a reasonable compromise. If we can remove from the bill the particular language on page 26, which starts on line 15 and runs through line 25, I shall be satisfied. I shall accept that, at least, because those lines contain the really dangerous language.

I agree with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] that on page 30 of the bill, starting on line 16 and running through line 18, involves a question which ought to call for an independent amendment. I do not think that matter should be handled in connection with the question I raise by presenting my amendment.

The Senator from Ohio brought out very clearly in the colloquy Wednesday the need for some modification of that language. I do not take the position that in the so-called star route system and rural free delivery the Post Office Department should be making deliveries of the second- and third-class material for the benefit of magazines such as Life, News Week and similar publications, without the publishers making a contribution to the operation of the star routes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It strikes me that if the section is allowed to remain in the bill, it will fix as a policy certain concessions which are now being made, and which even now are doubtful, but which in the future, when the conditions may change, would perhaps be of indefensible validity.

I subscribe to the thoughts expressed by the Senator from Oregon, that it is a dangerous practice for the present Congress to declare a policy which will have to be followed in the future—not mandatorily, of course, but the very fact that we declare a policy will have a strong influence against the making of changes which in the future may be thoroughly justified.

The Senator from Oregon has probably given this matter more study than I, because it was developed a few days ago, and the Senator has since had a chance to consider it.

Referring to subsection (2) on page 26, the one the Senator from Oregon asks be stricken, I find that the Senate version of the bill has added specifically this language in the sentence beginning on line 22:

The costs of other classes of mail and special services (except the fourth-class mail) shall be computed on an incremental or "out-of-pocket" cost basis.

On the day before yesterday we had difficulty in ascertaining the meaning of that provision.

As I understand, the Senator from Oregon, [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are familiar with the fact that in the report on House bill 5386, page 4, this

language appears in the second full paragraph:

The committee believes that the subsidiary classes should be priced on an incremental or "out-of-pocket" cost basis. ("Out-of-pocket" costs are those expenses incurred directly in handling a certain class of mail, and which would not be incurred if the additional service were not rendered.)

I think the last clause is loaded with dynamite. In the future the Post Office Department would have to prove, in assessing costs against other classes of mail, that the costs which were sought to be assessed were incurred newly and completely separate from those services which had to be generally rendered.

May I ask the Senator if I am correct in the understanding that the only time the Post Office Department would be able to assess out-of-pocket costs would be when it could prove that added services had to be provided for a specific type of mail?

Mr. MORSE. That is my interpretation. However, let me say to my friend from Ohio that if the committee denies it, that proves our case. That is, if the members of the committee deny such interpretation, then they have to admit that they are including language in the bill which is going to be the source of serious altercation and trouble in the future, because we can be pretty sure that under this language the magazines are going to take exactly the position which the Senator from Ohio is stating. The result will be that they will be entrenched in a right to continue to maintain the kind of subsidy they desire to retain.

Who among us can say what our position should be 1 year, 10 years, or 20 years from now, as to what the rates ought to be in respect to second-class mail?

I do not think the language is fair to the magazine publishers. Let me point out that this language works both ways. I do not think it is fair to the publishers of magazines to use language of policy in a bill which tends to give the publishers the impression they can count on costs based upon a particular interpretation of out-of-pocket costs, and 5, 10, or 15 years later, change the policy. They will say, "Listen, we built up our businesses on the basis that we thought this was the policy. We have made investments on that basis. Now you change the rules of the game on us."

I repeat, provision in the bill is not needed anyway; so why include it?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let me ask a further question concerning the correctness of my understanding. Again referring to the language in the bill, on page 26, the last sentence of subsection (2) reads:

The costs of other classes of mail and special services—

Which would mean second- and third-class mail—

shall be computed on an incremental or out-of-pocket cost basis.

If instead of using the words "shall be computed on an incremental or out-of-pocket cost basis" the definition which the committee gave of the out-of-pocket cost basis were used, the sentence would then read that—

The costs of other classes of mail and special services shall be borne by first-class mail users except in those instances when services are rendered which would not be incurred if the additional mail were not carried.

A close study of this declaration of policy will indicate that we would forever freeze any privileges granted, and forever freeze any disadvantage which may exist, unless some future Congress should decide to change the policy.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from Ohio used the term "freeze." I intended to use it myself in my analysis.

I now wish to emphasize it. If the language has any purpose at all in fixing a policy, it must have the purpose of icing the policy. It must have the purpose of freezing the policy. It must have the purpose of fixing the policy. It must have the purpose of setting the policy. I do not care what word is used to describe it. If this language means anything at all, what the committee is saying to the people of the United States is that "from now on this shall be the policy with regard to the adjustment of costs as between first-class and second-class mail, so far as the Post Office is concerned." I wish to say something about the first sentence to this policy statement in a moment. For the present I shall hear the Senator from Ohio through.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us look at page 30, to the paragraph identified by the numeral "(2)." In order to understand that paragraph we must read the first sentence of section 104—

The following shall be considered to be public services for the purposes of this title.

Then certain losses which are to be ascribed to public services are identified. Paragraph No. 2 on page 30 reads as follows:

The loss resulting from the operation of such public welfare postal services as the star route system, rural free delivery, third- and fourth-class post offices.

I should like to know whether I am correct in the understanding that the magazines to which reference was made last night are carried under those services.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; they are carried.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean that when such magazines are carried by either the star route system or rural free delivery, or when they are handled in third- or fourth-class post offices, they are to be considered as public services, and the losses sustained will have to be borne by the taxpayers as a whole.

Mr. MORSE. That is my interpretation; and that will be the contention, if we leave this statement of policy in the bill. We can be pretty sure of that. The result will be to increase the subsidies which the taxpayers as a whole are already paying to Life, Look, Time, Newsweek, and the others of them. They ought to pay a larger share of their cost than they would ever pay under this kind of arrangement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am almost through. I return now to the first

sentence of the language which I propose to strike:

The collection, transportation, and delivery of first-class mail is the primary function of the Postal Establishment.

Why do we say that? We do not need to say that. It is not necessary to say that. Certainly that was almost the only function in the beginning of the history of the postal service. In the early decades there was relatively little second-class mail, and such as there was was not very bulky. But when we come to consider the tons and tons of second- and third-class mail handled each year by the post office, we must take a look at certain other criteria when we deal with the phrase "primary function." Consider the workload. Consider what goes through the post office. Although we might all agree that it is necessary to see to it that first-class mail receives preferential treatment, I am not ready to say that I will accept a policy statement which gives the impression that the primary function of serving the American people, postalwise, is first-class mail, and then move from that interesting premise of the syllogism into the next premise:

The cost of first-class mail shall be (a) the entire amount of the expenses allocated to first-class mail in the manner provided by this title—

And so forth. Therefore anything that is carried over and above that—to come to the conclusion "shall be computed on an incremental or out-of-pocket basis."

I think the danger is in the first premise of the policy statement, in paragraph (2). So I stress the point that we must consider the postal service as a totality. It is a mistake to seek to break it up, as this policy statement seeks to do, so that we can get ourselves into a position to "soak" first-class mail users with the overwhelming part of the cost of serving the postal needs of the people of the United States.

I happen to believe that in due course of time the Senate will adopt an amendment which I offered yesterday, and which was then rejected. I am convinced that in due course of time the American taxpayers will say to Members of Congress, "We are not going to pay such a large subsidy to magazines and newspapers. We are not greatly moved by all the plaintive pleas to the effect that some of them may go out of business if we do not subsidize them."

The American people will eventually say to the Congress of the United States, "In 1958 you did not raise second- and third-class rates high enough." My amendment was rejected, but I shall wait for the reaction of the American people in the years immediately ahead. I am convinced that it will be in support of the principle which I defended on the floor of the Senate yesterday. However, I will not sit here without raising my voice in protest against language which is subject to the interpretation—as the Senator from Ohio has pointed out—that, to all intents and purposes, we are freezing the rates of second- and third-class users so that in the future it will be more difficult for Congress to raise such rates.

I wish to stress the fact that I do not accept a so-called out-of-pocket formula, because if the Post Office did not carry this huge bulk of mail, and if we were to limit mail service to first-class service, Senators can see what would happen. There would be a great shrinkage in the postal facilities themselves.

Let me say to the postal workers of America that they have a tremendous stake in the argument which the senior Senator from Oregon is making on the floor of the Senate today. Let me say to the postal workers, whose legislative representatives are seated in the galleries, and with whom I disagree vehemently with respect to some of the positions they have taken on this bill, that I am raising my voice in protection of the postal employees here today when I protest this language. If we leave this language in the bill, I say to the postal workers that they will find it more difficult in the future to obtain the wage increases which they will need if we allow magazines and newspapers to have their rates frozen, not by way of specific rates, but by way of a legislative policy approach. It will rise to plague the postal workers of the country.

I am moving to strike out this language because I think the postal workers ought to be protected—sometimes against themselves. They have needed such protection in connection with this bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Oregon says that he is convinced that in due course of time the people of America will rise up and recognize that the subsidy which is being paid to the very prosperous publishers is unfair, improper, un-American, and in contradiction of the principles of our free enterprise system. I agree with him. I have talked with other Senators on both sides of the aisle who also agree with him.

I point out to the Senator from Oregon that in due course of time this will not take place if the statement of policy referred to remains in the bill. As the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Ohio have pointed out, this language would freeze the policy of applying to second- and third-class mail only incremental costs.

I should like to ask any Member of the Senate who is on the floor this morning, on either side of the question, if he can give me any example of a business which would say to one customer, "we will load all of our overhead, as well as our cost of production, on what we sell to you on the product which we sell to you, but to another customer we will sell on the basis of our out-of-pocket cost." A business that did that would not stay in business very long. I do not believe that any business administration expert in the country would approve of that kind of allocation. That certainly is not a good business practice.

I should also like to say to the senior Senator from Oregon that I could not agree with him more completely with regard to the long term tragedy the adoption of this section of the bill would cause to the postal workers. I say that

because it is no secret that there will be an attempt made to tie in with the bill a postal pay increase provision. We heard it on the radio this morning and have read about it in the newspapers for a long time.

Of course I approve of an increase in salary for the postal workers, and we should do everything in our power to give it to them. It is something that they have needed for a long time; they should have received it during the last session of Congress.

If the section of the bill under discussion is left in the bill it will mean that in the future if postal workers want an increase in salary, the request will likely be tied in with a 7-cent stamp or a 10-cent stamp, or something of that kind. That will make it much more difficult for the Congress to enact a pay increase bill.

Two precedents would be established by the proposed language. In the first place, as the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, it would be the third or fourth precedent of a salary increase being tied in with a rate bill.

Furthermore, there is also contained in the bill the statement that in the future only out-of-pocket costs will be related to second- and third-class mail. That leaves only first-class mail to carry the full burden. I should like to underline what the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] pointed out so well, that the committee has added to the House bill a sentence which has powerful dynamite in it. It is that "the costs of other classes of mail and special services—except fourth-class mail—shall be computed on an incremental or out-of-pocket cost basis."

That language was not contained in the bill as it passed the House. That is the most dangerous provision of the bill. It contradicts completely good business experience and sound accounting practices.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to have it pointed out to me if my understanding is correct or incorrect on this point. As I understand, to the second and other class users of mail other than first class, by the proposed policy, the Federal Government in the future would say: "The only charges we will impose against you are those which are inescapable in the handling of your mail. If at the end of 4 hours our employees complete the carrying of first-class mail and have 4 hours of leisure, and during that time carry your mail, we have no new costs. Therefore, it costs you nothing. You will only pay those costs which we add to our general operating expenses in the delivery of first-class mail."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Absolutely. I should like to point out to the Senator from Ohio and to the Senator from Oregon that the costs of the postal service are tremendous. They include the cost of maintaining the post offices, the cost of constructing post offices, the cost of transportation, the cost of equipment, and the salaries of the employees, who must be in the offices to deliver the first-

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2701

class mail anyway. All those costs will be chargeable only to first-class mail and not to second- or third-class mail.

To draw an analogy, it would be as if a person were to travel on the railroad—because the Post Office operates virtually as a railroad operates—and the railroad were to say to him, "We will charge you only the out-of-pocket cost." In that case the charge would be practically nothing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Unless the railroad had to attach a special car to the train.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; and if he took all his friends along.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then he would have to pay for the special car.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Exactly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee and the attention of the ranking minority member of the committee, and the attention of the other members of the committee, including the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Kentucky. I wish to make a plea this morning when, to use a military term, we are trying to reform our lines. There is no doubt that there have been honest and sincere differences among us on the bill. We still have a great objective to accomplish after we pass the rate bill; and that is to do what we can to protect the salary interests of the postal workers. I say very frankly to the chairman of the committee that there are those of us who find ourselves in a very difficult position from the standpoint of legislative policy, because we do not like combining the two things in one bill. At the same time, if we could get a rate bill—and I say this good-naturedly—with respect to which we would have to hold our noses but still could vote for, in the hope that some corrections will be made in conference which we believe ought to be made, then we could go along.

I believe that is what the eventual fate of the bill will be, because I am confident that Senators will go into conference and walk out with all the bacon. I believe there will be a little compromising among the conferees. If we could at least come to some reasonable agreement on some of these items that disturb those of us who heretofore have been in the minority on some of the issues, we might have a more united front on the other problems which confront us in connection with the postal pay matter.

The Senator from South Carolina cannot question the sincerity of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], or the senior Senator from Oregon in our deep concern about the dangerous potentialities of the language which we seek to strike. So I say, with my arms open, and in a plaintive plea, What is offered me, if anything, by way of conference?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senator from Oregon will modify his amendment, and move to strike out what he has been discussing all along, namely, the last sentence of paragraph (2) on page 26, that would get rid of the out-of-pocket costs.

Out-of-pocket costs, as we understood them when the discussions took place

during the hearings, are the costs of some of the functions which are necessary for the handling of first-class mail, but which are not necessary for any other class. For instance, it is necessary for the mail trucks to stop at the boxes placed throughout the city and to pick up the letters deposited there. That is a part of the first-class service.

Second-class mail is not usually deposited in the mailboxes. I say that the out-of-pocket charges should not be assessed against first-class mail. That is our reason for including these provisions in the bill.

But if the Senator from Oregon becomes excited over it, we are willing to try to accommodate him.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from South Carolina that I am very much excited over it, with my eyes wide open to the future. That is why I am concerned.

The present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and I are enjoying in the cloakrooms a reputation among our colleagues for being David Harums, at times, in fields other than the legislative process.

I thank my colleague from South Carolina. I should be very happy to modify my amendment to conform with the suggestion the Senator from South Carolina has just made, and I now do so.

Mr. President, I modify my amendment by moving to strike out, on page 26, line 22, beginning with the words, "The costs," through line 25, with the understanding that the Senator from South Carolina will take the amendment to conference.

If this opinion is shared by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the ranking Republican member of the committee, I want him to know that I deeply appreciate his cooperation. This is not the first time he has been willing to cooperate with the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have conferred with all the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service who are on the floor, and they all agree to the proposal.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the action which has just been taken by the senior Senator from Oregon in striking out the last sentence of paragraph (2) on page 26.

I have been listening to the debate. I myself was trying to think of some language which might be inserted in this particular section so as to preserve what the committee wanted to do. We are trying to find some basis for setting aside a certain percentage or a certain dollar sum of money for the public service of the Post Office Department.

I will have to admit—and I say this for the benefit of the chairman and the other members of the committee—that we were forced, so to speak, by pressure from the Senate to report the bill in order that the pay-raise bill might be considered, before we really had a thorough opportunity to study these sections. I say this in fairness to the chairman.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I may say that I had a speaking engage-

ment at home, and I had to have the report read to me over the telephone. I approved it over the telephone. That is how rushed we were in submitting the report.

Mr. CARLSON. I thought the RECORD should be clear on that point. We submitted the report without having made the study which should have been made.

The language of the section contains an important policy statement, as the Senator from Oregon has so well stressed. If the agreement is satisfactory to him, I shall certainly be happy to work on that problem.

Mr. MORSE. It is a satisfactory compromise. As the Senator knows, I preferred to have the whole section stricken; but this is a satisfactory compromise.

Mr. President, I yield the floor by asking that action be taken on my amendment as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], as modified.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I express my acquiescence in and support of the amendment, as modified, offered by my senior colleague.

If I may have the attention of the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I may say that I have only commendation for the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the ranking minority member for their acceptance of the amendment, as modified.

In fairness to the chairman, I think the RECORD should show that not one member of the committee, on either side of the table, to my knowledge, protested the so-called policy statement at the time. If I am not mistaken, every member of the committee, on both sides of the table, acquiesced in the policy statement, at least by silence. This may have been due to the fact that the committee was under heavy pressure, from both sides of the aisle, to report a rate bill, so that it could accompany the postal pay bill, and therefore assure a greater opportunity of acceptance at the White House when the pay bill finally arrives there, as we trust it will do.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am delighted to acknowledge that I was in error, not having had the opportunity to peruse carefully the 49-page bill. I know I should have done so. I am not a member of the subcommittee which is principally responsible for the bill. However, I recognize my mistake and acknowledge the fact that I did not speak up in committee, because I had not had an opportunity to read the bill in its entirety.

I am extremely grateful to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] for having called this matter to my attention.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It seems to me to be very helpful that a somewhat confusing and ambiguous policy statement has been eliminated from a substantive rate bill. I think this is helpful. I believe every Senator regards it as such.

However, I desire to emphasize one thing, and in this I particularly wish the attention of the Senator from Ohio, because I know he has been concerned about the so-called policy statement. The basic fact still remains that we must not depart heedlessly or cavalierly from the fundamental, underlying policy which has governed the United States postal system throughout its history. That policy is that first-class mail has paid more than its share of the so-called assigned costs. If that be wrong, then there should be extensive hearings, discussion, debate, and analysis before changing the policy. But it should not be changed in the heat of debate, because it might seem somewhat politically helpful or opportunistic to say to the people who mail first-class letters, that they are being charged more than their assigned share of the cost.

I again wish to state for the RECORD, because I think the facts are irrefutable and pertinent, that during the entire history of the post office system, first-class mail has carried more than its share of the assigned costs. I have made a cursory study of the Senate debates, and I can find no very important evidence, if any, that any distinguished Members of this body have challenged that long, historical precedent.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator now is arguing for out-of-pocket costs. He is arguing that some costs should be assigned to first class which are assigned to second and third class, because more than 100 percent of the cost is being charged to first-class mail.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am arguing that we should not, in the heat of a Senate debate, completely upset the whole pattern of operation of the post-office system. If we do, we shall be disrupting the mail service and shall be endangering the pay and welfare of the postal employees. We shall be endangering all the communications which pass through the mails.

I call this to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who first mentioned to me his very real and justified fear about some of the inclusions in the policy statement.

This morning I received from the Post Office Department a statement which I should like to read. A few days ago I presented to the Senate the figure for the portion of cost assigned to first-class mail from 1926 to the present time. On that particular day the Post Office Department did not have available for me the figures for the periods prior to 1926. I now have a statement on that matter; it was sent to me by the office of the Postmaster General. The statement is very brief, and I shall read it, as follows:

FIRST-CLASS MAIL COSTS PRIOR TO 1926

While no detailed cost figures are available for the Post Office Department prior to 1926 (the date of installation of cost-ascertainment reports) an analysis of the annual reports of the Postmasters General for the years prior to 1926 indicates conclusively that first-class mail consistently paid an

average of at least 140 percent of its allocated costs exclusive of the charges for the many costly preferential services given first-class mail.

In addition, I repeat that in 1945, when Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman, respectively, occupied the White House—because that was the year of the unfortunate and tragic death of President Roosevelt—the share of the costs sustained by first-class mail reached 164.7 percent. I believe that was the high-water mark in our history. There is no evidence that Senators, either in committee or on the floor, challenged that or questioned it.

I shall be willing to have the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service hold extensive hearings to determine whether the historic pattern which has governed the postal system since its establishment should be continued.

I do not believe postal policy which has existed for nearly two centuries should be changed in a few hours on the floor of the Senate.

Furthermore, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the situation in residential neighborhoods. Probably most of us live in residential neighborhoods. I do, and I assume that the distinguished Senator from Ohio does. It has been pointed out to me by career appointees and officials of the Post Office Department that the very costly and expensive mail collections in residential neighborhoods are, virtually entirely and exclusively, for first-class mail. Second-class and third-class mail and nearly all the parcel post are delivered to the post offices. The postal trucks which we see moving by day and by night, in good weather and in bad, are often primarily for the purpose of picking up the first-class mail. We do not want to change the cost-ascertainment structures, so that the people will have to deliver their first-class mail to the post offices.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I concur completely in the elimination of this vague, ambiguous, and dangerous portion of the policy statement. I think the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] have rendered a great service in pointing out to us its potential hazards. I have been pleased to join them in voting today on the floor of the Senate in effort to delete it from the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On yesterday, I stated to the Senator from Oregon that I deeply appreciated his sincerity and good purpose in approaching the solution of the problem which now confronts the Senate. At that time I said that in his presentation he emphasized the bad as much as he did the good. No better tribute can I pay to him for his objectivity.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as always, the Senator from Ohio is very kind.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I desire to say that I agree with the Senator from Ohio that

the Senator from Oregon is a great man, a true liberal, a great asset to the United States, and a great credit to his State.

But, Mr. President, I wish to say to him that I could not disagree with him more on the issue he has just discussed.

I believe it would be a very good thing to have the committee reconsider the statement relating to the primary function of the Post Office Department. I shall not repeat the statements which have been made here in the last few days. I believe my position has been made clear.

Mr. President, I believe it is ridiculous for us to continue something simply because it has been in existence in the past and has been supported by great men such as Franklin D. Roosevelt or Bob La Follette.

Nevertheless, I agree that the Senator from Oregon is completely sincere in the statement he has made. This disagreement is one between two Senators who respect each other, I am sure.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin would never take the position that those who have been here in the past have been derelict in not changing the system of the allocation of costs in the Post Office Department.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I shall not attack George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and other prominent men in our history, of course; but I believe it is ridiculous to have a postal system in which more than 100 percent of the cost of carrying letters is imposed on those who write them. That makes no sense whatever. I do not care who favors it; I believe it is wrong.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to thank my colleague for his support of this amendment.

I wish to repeat that whatever may be the differences he and I have regarding other matters in connection with the bill, certainly they are sincere and honest differences, not personal ones.

He has demonstrated again that when we are of one mind on a particular matter, we join forces. I wish him to know that I appreciate very much his support of the amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his generous remarks and for his courtesy in connection with this debate.

Mr. President, I have been told by career officials of the Post Office Department that, unless first-class mail is assigned these cost ascertainment amounts, which it has traditionally borne, there simply will not be the type of mail collection, the type of mail delivery, and the type of postal personnel we have always had in this country. They have told me that this is not only the practice in the United States, but it is also the practice in virtually all civilized countries which have modern postal systems.

I am sure that the Senator from Wisconsin and I agree that before the present system—whatever may be its merits—is drastically changed, there should be extensive and exhaustive hearings

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2703

by the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I know he will agree as to that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I certainly agree wholeheartedly. I agree that we should go into this matter very thoroughly. I do not think any policy should be established on the floor of the Senate, or on the floor of the House of Representatives. That is one reason, among many others, why I supported the position taken by the Senator from Oregon, because he objected to the inclusion in the postal rate bill of a statement of policy.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Oregon for bringing up this matter in connection with section 103, and particularly in connection with the subsection on incremental costs.

The phrase "incremental costs" is very mouth filling and very ear filling. I looked up, in Webster's dictionary, the meaning of the word "incremental." I am not sure that even Noah Webster knew just what "incremental" might mean, because in Webster's dictionary we find that word defined, as follows:

Incremental—Of, pertaining to, or resulting from increments, increase, or growth.

Then we find the following definition of the word "increment":

Increment—An increasing, growth in bulk, quantity, number, value, etc.; enlargement, increase.

After that part of the definition, we find the following rather interesting and qualifying statement in that huge, 15-pound book, a copy of which I have in my office:

A slight or imperceptible augmentation.

Mr. President, that is a wonderful definition. If we relate that definition to the language contained in section 103, and particularly to the part of the section relating to first-class mail and the other classes of mail which show out-of-pocket costs "on an incremental basis," we find that that could mean a slight or an imperceptible augmentation in the future. Mr. President, in the days that lie ahead, that language would probably be found to be the greatest plague ever to confront the Post Office Department.

What is "an imperceptible augmentation"? What is "an imperceptible enlargement or an increase"? I do not know.

This whole problem is certainly not new to me. I had my first experience with postal-rate problems in the House of Representatives. I had plenty of it as a member of the Subcommittee on Post Office Appropriations in the House, where I served for a good many years. There came before the committee first one Postmaster General and then another. I remember Jim Farley very well, whom I esteem as a friend. I remember Bob Hannegan, of St. Louis. I remember Jesse Donaldson, of Shelby, Ill., who was in the service 40 years before he became Postmaster General. But always the questions arose whether it was

a business enterprise and what the cost ascertainment figures showed.

I care not how many experts one may consult, he will still come to the conclusion that the Post Office operation is a rather indivisible thing. I doubt very much whether we can obtain the most precise figures to allocate costs to one class of mail or another, in an operation which encompasses \$3 billion, 500,000 workers, 85,000 vehicles, 33,000 post offices, 8,200 branches, and 32,000 rural free delivery routes. It is an operation that really makes General Motors and General Electric and other large companies pale by comparison, even though employee-wise they seem to be pretty large. In the Post Office there is a diversity of operations. I do not know quite how its operations can be divided.

I desire to be pretty careful about any expression of postal policy. In 1951 I served on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate. I believe the distinguished chairman of the committee will agree I had some small part in raising the question concerning the definition of policy by the Congress. Where are we to draw the line? What are we to allocate against the taxpayers—all, or none, or some item in between? If duck stamps are sold by the postoffices, how much does that service cost? Frankly, I do not think it costs nearly so much as some of the "eager beavers," who have been testifying on the bill, have stated. How much does it cost to count deer in the Michigan peninsula? Perhaps twenty or thirty or forty thousand dollars; but it certainly does not run into the figure, the Advisory Council embalmed in the very fancy brochure it issued. I read it from start to finish. Then I read the answer by the Post Office Department. Then I read the most recent brochure. Three times I read the article written by the distinguished chairman of the committee, which has published recently. Then I sat down and looked off at the wall. I thought perhaps we had better be a little careful, when we encounter a bit of fancy semanticism like incremental, and we should look out.

My colleagues know that words are amazing things. We know of a book entitled "Words That Won the War," which was written of World War I by George Creel.

There was also one written about words that won the war in World War II. We are constantly operating in the field of etymology, semantics, and words. We are not going to interpret those words. If someone takes exception to their meaning he can go into a court and say to the distinguished gentlemen in black robes, "This is what we think it means." The intent of Congress is one of those fictional things we hear of. I read a decision by one of the circuit courts of appeals not so very long ago, reported in the Harvard Law Review, in which it was stated there is no such thing as intent of Congress. It is a fiction; the words used by Congress mean what they think they mean.

The only reason why I take the floor today, for only a little while, is to make

sure that when learned men in the law refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and say, "This is what we think Congress meant," we may be extremely certain that they know what the junior Senator from Illinois meant when he voted for the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Oregon.

I am delighted that the phrase is to be deleted from the bill. I do not want a judge to say, "Well, this is what I think Congress meant when they talked about incremental costs," because those costs may start from the day the President affixes his signature to the act. They will be only the little things in the whole load, which in the first instance was assessed as a primary responsibility upon first-class mail. When that is done, I think a disservice is perpetrated upon the people of this country.

So the junior Senator from Illinois wants only to be sure that if learned justices probe congressional intent, there will be no doubt what the junior Senator from Illinois had in mind when he cast his vote of approval for the Morse amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Illinois for the very fine argument he has made in support of my amendment. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I leave it as I started, and return to the text.

When I encounter a word like "incremental"—and, frankly, this is the first time that word has ever given me trouble in 25 years of legislative experience—if I had no other reason to want its deletion from the bill, it would be simply because my feeble capacity does not encompass all of the juridical implications it might have.

I earnestly hope the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FOBLITZELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have listened to the Senator from Illinois with a great deal of amusement. I have sent to the committee for a copy of the report which the committee, during the 83d Congress, paid almost \$100,000 to have prepared, in which the out-of-pocket theory is the major recommendation. I now have the report in my hand, and I shall read from it. Probably the Senator from Illinois forgot about it when he was speaking a few moments ago, but I find contained in the report the following language:

In order to ascertain a fair cost of secondary products the Nation's top accountants have devised ways of charging to the primary products all the costs necessary to produce and distribute such primary products. It is therefore considered in many cases that the fairest cost of the secondary products should include only the direct or incremental—

The same words—
(sometimes referred to as out-of-pocket)
costs necessary to produce and distribute
such products.

In all fairness, I think it should be said
that was the recommendation of the com-
mittee.

Then for the past 2 years the commit-
tee worked on the question.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will
the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I
yield.

Mr. CARLSON. That was in the 84th
Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina.
That is correct. Reference to the cost
will be found in the report. That is
where the out-of-pocket cost provision
comes from. It was put in the bill by the
committee, and the committee passed on
it and reported the bill to the Senate.
So reference was only to things which
were not necessary to be done except for
second- and third-class mail matter.

As I mentioned a few moments ago,
there are many boxes along the street
which the mailman must visit. The Post
Office Department sends trucks around at
various hours to pick up the first-class
mail, in order to attempt to get the mail
out on the next train. The Post Office
Department does not provide that service
for second- and third-class mail. There-
fore, the out-of-pocket costs should be
charged, in that particular instance, to
the first-class mail and not the second-
and third-class mail. That duty is per-
formed by trucks, and the costs should be
charged against first-class mail.

Those are things the two committees
found to be true. There were other in-
stances where it was found that certain
service was performed for the first-class
mail and the first-class mail only. That
being so, first-class mail should be
charged for it, when the costs for the
various classes of mail are allocated
among the first, second, third, and fourth
classes.

I desired to have clarified the ques-
tion how it came to be in the bill, and why
the language was used by the commit-
tee. This was not something thought
up overnight, and we have been think-
ing about it for many, many years.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I call
up an amendment which I have proposed
to H. R. 5836.

I should like to have the attention of
the chairman of the committee, the
Senator from South Carolina [Mr.
JOHNSTON]. I have discussed this
amendment with the distinguished chair-
man of the Committee on Post Office and
Civil Service, and I should like to have
it considered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina.
The Senator may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 43,
between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to
insert the following new section:

BOOKS FOR THE BLIND

SEC. 206. The act entitled "An act to fur-
ther amend the acts for promoting the cir-
culation of reading matter among the blind,"
approved October 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 737), is
amended by inserting immediately after "for
which no subscription fee is charged" a semi-

colon and the following: "books, or pages
thereof, in raised characters, whether pre-
pared by hand or printed, which contain no
advertisements, when furnished by any per-
son to a blind person without cost to such
blind person."

On page 43, line 4, strike out "206" and
insert "207."

On page 43, line 14, strike out "207"
and insert "208."

On page 44, line 10, strike out "208"
and insert "209."

On page 45, line 4, strike out "209"
and insert "210."

On page 45, line 10, strike out "210"
and insert "211."

On page 45, line 24, strike out "211"
and insert "212."

On page 46, line 24, strike out "212"
and insert "213."

On page 47, line 1, strike out "and 209"
and insert "208, and 210."

On page 47, line 13, strike out "211"
and insert "212."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should
like to give a short explanation of the
amendment for the RECORD.

If adopted, the amendment would add
a new section, on page 43 of the printed
bill, between lines 2 and 3, which would
be numbered section 206. The sections
now in the bill, which would follow my
amendment, would be renumbered ac-
cordingly.

The new section 206, established by
my amendment, would amend Public
Law 270, 77th Congress, approved Octo-
ber 14, 1941, which is an act dealing with
postal rates, for promoting the circula-
tion of reading matter among the blind.
Public Law 270, among other things,
permits books, pamphlets, and other
reading matter, or sound reproduction
records, published in raised print, by
hand or printed—for the use of the
blind—when sent to blind readers by
public institutions for the blind, or pub-
lic libraries, when returned by blind
readers, to be transmitted by United
States mail free of postage.

The amendment also provides that
magazines, periodicals, and other regu-
larly issued publications or volumes of
the Holy Scriptures in raised print can
likewise be transmitted to the blind with-
out cost in the mails.

I emphasize that these are nonprofit
transactions, where material is furnished
without cost to the blind, and under
regulations as to weight and other mat-
ters prescribed by the Postmaster Gen-
eral.

It will be noted that these exemptions
from postal charge—and they are worthy
exemptions—apply to literature regu-
larly published, or the stocks in libraries
or public institutions.

It has come to my attention that there
is another important source of literature
for the blind which does not enjoy the
exemption. Many volunteer workers
print by hand, by means of special type-
writers and other mechanisms, books for
the blind. I am informed that in many
cases, it is through such books that blind
persons are able to secure an education—
by means of the books, transcribed
laboriously into braille, by volunteer
workers who unselfishly devote their abili-
ties and time to helping the blind. But
when these volunteer workers have pre-

pared the books and send the books
through the mail to the blind, they must
pay postage. And the postage can be
very heavy.

I have one letter which I should like
to place in the RECORD. It is from a
volunteer worker in my State engaged in
transcribing books for a blind person in
South Carolina without cost. But the
cost of mailing the heavy books to the
blind person would approximate \$36. I
am sure there are many other illustra-
tions. My amendment would correct this
situation, since it provides that "books,
or pages thereof, in raised characters,
whether prepared by hand or printed,
which contains no advertisements, when
furnished by any person to a blind per-
son without cost to such blind person,"
shall be transmitted in the United States
mails free of postage.

I know this matter was not considered
in the committee. Nevertheless, I hope
the amendment will be taken to con-
ference, for I believe it is a comparatively
simple matter for the consideration of
conferees.

Most important, I feel sure this
amendment would stimulate volunteer
work for the blind, and its effect would
be to bring to the blind additional litera-
ture which they want and need for edu-
cation and for their enjoyment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-
sent that the letter to which I have re-
ferred be printed in the RECORD at this
point.

There being no objection, the letter
was ordered to be printed in the RECORD,
as follows:

PEWEE VALLEY, KY., October 22, 1957.
Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR COOPER: As a volunteer
braille transcriber, I have found that there
seems to be no provisions made for volunteer
workers to send loose braille pages to the
blind at a reduced postal rate. Blind people
and various institutions have franking privi-
leges and can mail appliances, books, maga-
zines, etc., at a rate of 1 cent per pound or
for nothing, according to the contents.

I am, at present, transcribing a college
literature book of 1,066 pages for a student
in South Carolina. This book will consist
of more than 40 braille volumes and the
estimated postage will be over \$36, figured at
the regular rate of 16 cents per pound. The
braille volume itself weighs approximately
3 pounds and must be carefully packed in
a heavy corrugated carton so as to avoid
crushing or creasing the manuscript pages
and indentations. I have found that these
packages run upward from 4 pounds per
volume.

I am happy to do this volunteer work, but
I am wondering if you are aware of the fact
that volunteer workers are penalized and, in
many instances, the blind recipient is with-
out the necessary desired transcriptions be-
cause the volunteer worker lacks the finances,
after paying for paper and typewriter, to pay
the high rate of postage.

Will you kindly let me hear from you.
Sincerely yours,

Mrs. ANN K. BROECKER.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina.
Mr. President, it is true that the commit-
tee did not consider the matter covered
by the amendment. The committee had
no hearings with regard thereto, and did
not discuss the matter whatsoever. I can
see, however, some justification for some

such amendment as the Senator from Kentucky has offered.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that such an amendment is an expansion, involving a little more of the "free ride," but I am willing to take the amendment to conference and consider it, to see what should be done in regard to it.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished Senator very much.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Speaking for the Republican side of the committee, Mr. President, we are happy to accept the suggestion of the senior Senator from Kentucky to take this amendment to conference. It so happens that the American Printing House for the Blind is located in our State, in Louisville, Ky. I have had a degree of familiarity with many pieces of legislation which have dealt with that organization over the past years.

I appreciate the objectives which the senior Senator from Kentucky is seeking. So far as I can see, his amendment is practical and feasible and in keeping with our past actions on this matter.

Speaking for the Republican side of the committee again, I am happy to accept the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I call up for consideration the two amendments to H. R. 5836 designated "2-27-58-C" and "2-27-58-D," which, by unanimous consent previously granted, are to be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, it is proposed to strike out lines 1 through 17, inclusive.

On page 46, line 24, to strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)."

One page 47, line 7, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

One page 47, line 8, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

On page 36, line 25, before the quotation marks insert the following:

And except that the minimum postage on each individually addressed copy of news papers or periodicals maintained by and in the interests of religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, shall be one-eighth of 1 cent.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] be added as additional cosponsors of these amendments, which are to be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield for that purpose with the understanding that I shall retain my right to the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

(At this point Mr. CARROLL yielded to Mr. GOLDWATER for the insertion of certain matters in the Appendix, which appear under appropriate headings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc, offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am opposing the amendment, but I also ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the persistence of the Senator from Colorado has paid off handsomely, and we shall be able to register our votes on his amendment.

Mr. CARROLL. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from California. We shall see whether persistence pays off.

Mr. President, this amendment has been thoroughly debated on at least two separate occasions, with the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who opposes it.

The purpose of the amendment is very simple. What I seek to do is to restore to the pending bill certain provisions contained in the House bill. The purpose of the amendment is to restore the law and the postal rules and regulations which have been in existence with respect to religious, scientific, educational, philanthropic, farm, labor, and veterans' groups second-class publications, as well as the publications of fraternal associations.

The law and the rate have applied to them since 1925. Now it is sought in the

Senate to change the rate. The House bill made no change. No hearing in the Senate committee was accorded to those groups, although it is now sought to increase their rate 100 percent.

The RECORD for the past 2 days reveals the comments of the junior Senator from Colorado on this amendment, and the comments of the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma. At this time I digress to commend the junior Senator from Oklahoma for his brilliant presentation and his remarks on the bill. They show the results of a great deal of work.

I think he will agree with me, and I believe other members of the committee will agree with me, that this part of the bill has not been extensively considered. The committee has failed to do its homework on this section of the bill. That is evidenced by the colloquies in the RECORD on this subject. There is no need to labor the point.

The purport of the nonprofit publication provisions of the bill has suddenly become known throughout the country. The groups which I have named have within the past 48 hours learned of the effect on them of the new rates. Now they are descending upon Congress and asking why the rates are being changed without providing them a hearing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First I want to compliment and commend the Senator from Colorado for his initiative in this connection. I am very much pleased to be included as one of the cosponsors of the amendment.

It seems to me that the situation which pertains to the subject matter under discussion at this moment is similar to that which pertained to the provisions relating to limitations on parcel-post weights and sizes. It will be recalled that the limitations on weights and sizes of parcel-post packages were modified in the bill. There were those who said that inadequate testimony had been taken, and that the subject was a separate item, under a separate public law, namely, Public Law 199.

Mr. CARROLL. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And that, therefore, the Senate should consider the subject in connection with the provisions of that public law at a later date.

Therefore, the original limitations on weights and sizes of parcel-post packages, as prescribed in Public Law 199, were left intact. This does not necessarily mean that some changes will not be made later, but it means that in this bill, so far as the Senate is concerned, there will be no change in the law.

I recognize that parcel-post service is a subject which relates primarily to commercial transactions, or to shipments of goods and materials which are rarely shipped in connection with charitable activities.

In the present instance the situation relates to publications of civic, veterans, religious, and educational organizations.

There are publications which are nonprofit and publications which are dis-

seminated for the betterment of a community, without regard to any mercenary or profit motive. It appears to me that if we are to alter the rate structure and substantially increase it, such publications should be entitled to a hearing. Such an alteration should be made only after the parties concerned and the institutions involved and the publication affected have had an opportunity to be heard. That opportunity has been denied.

I saw the telegrams which came to my office from veterans groups and church groups and many organizations of a civic nature, to the effect that in connection with the bill under consideration they have never had an opportunity to make their case, relating to the rate structure for publications of a non-profit, educational, philanthropic, and charitable nature.

I say to the Senator from Colorado that we would be doing a distinct disservice to the groups and the individuals affected by a change in the rate structure if we did not at least give them an opportunity to be heard. Furthermore, I cannot believe that Congress wants literally to threaten the very existence of some of these publications by an increase in the rate structure without at least giving the right of free speech and the right of petition to the interested parties.

Therefore I join with the Senator from Colorado in offering the amendment. I add, in conclusion, that the postal service is not merely a business of the Government. The postal service is a public service institution. The postal service does not have as one of its standards the making of a profit.

There is an honest difference of opinion in the Senate, now as in years past, as to whether the postal service ought to be put on a pay-as-you-go basis. When we think of the many community services which are performed by the post offices, and the many public services which are performed by the post offices, such as the rural free delivery, and the aid that is given to publications, so that there may be a dissemination of educational and informative material, I believe it is very doubtful that the postal service ought to be put on a pay-as-you-go or balanced-budget type of operation, in which the revenues taken in from the users are equivalent to the expenses for the operation of the Department. Frankly, the users of the postal service should not be required to subsidize particular services of the postal service. It seems to me that the community as a whole—the whole Nation—if there is to be any subsidy, should assume the responsibility of paying such a subsidy or such a service cost.

On the two principles—first, that no hearings were provided to the affected groups and, second, that the Post Office Department has an obligation to utilize its facilities for the welfare of the American people and the American institutions—I support the amendment which the Senator from Colorado advances. I hope that our colleagues will not vote a postal-rate structure upon publications of churches, veterans, unions, civic clubs, and philanthropic and charitable organizations, which will literally

threaten the very economic existence of those publications. That is what we are about to do unless we are very careful.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota for his very clear and concise statement of the issues involved in the amendment. As the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has said, we are dealing with a historic pattern. This rate structure has been in existence since 1925. Scientific, philanthropic, religious, and educational institutions are affected; and the rate increase, I am informed, threatens the existence of those groups. Whether or not that is true, at least one point is clear, they are entitled to a hearing. They have not been given that opportunity.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CARROLL. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not correct to say that the amount of money involved is about \$2 million?

Mr. CARROLL. About \$2 million; yes. That would be the amount of the increase if the provisions I seek to strike remain in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yet the increase, if it goes into effect, might very well threaten the existence of certain important scientific, educational, philanthropic, and church publications. We are not dealing with a subsidy of \$250 million or \$600 million. We are dealing with a small amount of money. Yet we are dealing with the very basic principle of American life, the right to be heard by the Government. Secondly, there is involved the principle of utilization of the services and facilities of the Government to promote the industry and the enlightenment, and the scientific progress and the spiritual improvement of the American people.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota with all fairness to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], I should like to say that the committee itself did not fully comprehend the effect of the formula. I do not believe the committee itself understood what was involved with reference to these particular groups who have not been afforded the opportunity of a hearing.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the distinguished and able junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Colorado. Many issues are before us today, and I shall be very brief. With his characteristic thoroughness, the Senator from Colorado has revealed injustices that would be perpetrated unless the amendments which he has offered for a group of Senators are adopted. As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I trust that my colleagues on the committee will join in accepting the amendments of the Senator from Colorado.

As the Senator from Minnesota has so vividly pointed out, there is only a small sum of money involved. At the same time, the very future of certain religious,

educational, labor, church, eleemosynary, and charitable organizations is at stake, particularly with reference to their ability to reach their members and other people upon whom they depend for financial support.

If I am not mistaken, I believe that the proposed increases concerning the publications of these charitable organizations is one reason that Senators such as the Senator from Colorado and myself voted against the amendment yesterday which would have increased the second-class mail rates. If I am not mistaken—and I do not like to speak for him—some of us feared, knowing of the existence of this clause in the bill, that by increasing the second-class rates we would have imposed still further increases on some of the charitable, church, and school organizations that issue publications which contain some advertising, albeit at extremely low rates.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator's estimate of yesterday's situation is absolutely correct. Yesterday's amendment to raise second-class rates would have increased the rates to nonprofit publications to an even greater extent than they are now increased by the committee's action.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It would have imposed a further injustice on the religious, charitable, and educational organizations the Senator from Colorado seeks to assist and rescue from this further imposition. I wish to assure the Senator from Colorado of my support and of my hope that a majority of the Senate will see fit to support his thoroughly merited amendments.

Mr. CARROLL. I think the Senator for his helpful explanation. This is a very involved matter. The application of the rates becomes a highly technical matter. The amendments I have presented have been carefully drafted and drawn to do only one thing, and that is to make the Senate bill conform to the provisions as passed by the House. I do not intend to open any new loopholes. I merely wish to have this section of the bill conform with the objectives of the House. It does not mean that the matter will be frozen. It can be changed next year or any time in the future if it is deemed necessary and just. However, the people affected are entitled to a hearing. That is the real issue here. We are legislating without providing the parties concerned a chance to furnish evidence of the effect on them. I thank the junior Senator from Oregon not only for the fine work he has done on the bill, but for his very helpful remarks with reference to my amendments.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Colorado is very kind, as usual.

Mr. CARROLL. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma and I have discussed this subject at length, even as recently as last night. The debate appears in the Record. I think our views are sufficiently known. I yield the floor.

Mr. MONROE. Mr. President, I must very reluctantly oppose my good friend from our time together as Members of the House, who is now my friend in the Senate, and whose meritorious

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2707

measures I have so often been happy to support.

I do not ask any other Member of the Senate to join with me in this fight, because I think that if he does he will be a target of most of the groups which have been enjoying preferential treatment in postal rates for about 50 years.

The Post Office has been carrying as second-class matter the publications of various charitable and other nonprofit organizations. These are "periodicals" published by "religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans' or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual."

At first blush, one would think that this section covers only some poor little church, a scientific society, or other similar organization.

At this time I wish to correct a statement I made last night. I apologize to my distinguished friend from Colorado for having accused him of also providing the reduced rate to publications of the National Association of Manufacturers, the Rotary Clubs, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and other chambers of commerce. I was not aware that, because of language in a House committee report a few years ago, the low rates are not extended to publications of this type.

But in following up the question, I find that the small organizations, for which my distinguished friend always has very sincere concern, are not the only ones which are included.

The Post Office is carrying such mail for a minimum rate of one-eighth of a cent. The Post Office must pick up such mail, take it to the post offices, and route it to the 48 States of the Union.

It is first handled by clerks, who must put it into the sacks for dispatch. Then it is taken to the railroad station and put on the train. On the train, it is re-routed by the railway mail clerks. It is forwarded to a distant city. It might be sent to Hawaii, Alaska, or California. When it is received at the post office of destination, it is placed on a sorting table. Then it is routed for delivery by either the city carrier or the rural carrier.

Then the heavily burdened postman, whose interests we hope to take care of later in a salary increase, puts it into his sack and carries it up the long walk to Mrs. Jones' house. There he deposits the leaflet.

For all the work which has been done for that organization, the Post Office collects one-eighth of a cent under the minimum rate.

It is true that the bill imposes a 100-percent increase on this mail. A 100-percent increase has been imposed on my church, on the Senator's church, on our charitable organizations, on our educational associations. But the sum total rate after that 100-percent increase comes to one-fourth of a cent. So the Post Office will now deliver these leaflets at the staggering charge of one-fourth of a cent. That is what all the bleeding is about in the Senate today.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from Oklahoma wish to comment on the suggestion of our good friend from Colorado that there were no hearings on this proposal, and that, therefore, it is a little unfair to increase this rate?

Mr. MONRONEY. The bill affects every single postage rate, in every category of mail the Post Office handles. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, over the years, has heard almost every argument that could be made about every one of these classes. It has continued to review the proposition.

Consequently, as we tried to meet the deadline desired by the leadership of both parties because of the deficit of the Post Office Department, and the urgency of the need for a wage increase for the underpaid postal workers, we did rush a little in reporting the bill.

If we agree to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, we will continue the present one-eighth rate. It will not go to the one-fourth rate. Those of us who have served on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and have sat through many long days of hearings, maintain that the postal service cannot begin to deliver any piece of mail anywhere in the United States for one-eighth of a cent.

Let us consider the cases cited by my distinguished friend from Colorado. Certainly the increase will hit labor publications. The labor publications will have to pay more for publications mailed at a minimum rate. If a publication were heavy enough to go by the bulk rate, the rate would be reduced, under the bill.

Under the bill there is one second-class rate, which is reduced by a specified percentage for religious and educational publications. It will not be difficult to figure out what the rate is, and we believe that this is a businesslike approach.

For charitable organizations and nonprofit organizations there will be a 50-percent discount from the rate for commercial mail. But the minimum rate will still be raised 100 percent, bringing it up from one-eighth to one-fourth of a cent.

I am sure that some organizations may be hurt, and I know some Senators are concerned about this. The Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Minnesota, and other Senators are sincere in this concern. But let me read the names of a few organizations that are enjoying this free ride. I apologize for having incorrectly included the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the problem which is confronting the Senate at this time. I was hoping we could take this matter to conference and solve it there. I am not certain we thoroughly understand what we are doing; at least, I have been concerned about it. I realize that there is a 300-percent increase, from one-eighth cent to one-half cent.

I think we might be able to work that out in conference. Therefore, I do not say at this time that I will support the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, because I think it freezes the situation. But I want to be in a position, in conference, to do something about the amendment. If the Senator from Oklahoma will permit me to do so, I wish to read a few paragraphs from a letter I received from Mr. Charles E. Sweet, who is the rate expert for Capper Publications, Inc., Topeka, Kans. He has testified before Senate and House committees for many years. In my opinion, he is one of the best rate experts in the United States. Here are some of the things which disturb me, and about which I am really concerned. He says:

I am writing you in regard to one clause in the postal rate bill which has been reported out by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

I should like to have the views of the Senator from Oklahoma on this. I continue:

I refer to the clause which would raise the minimum price per piece to one-half cent on second-class matter. As you know, the minimum is now one-eighth cent; and in the bill passed by the House last year it was raised to one-quarter cent.

Now I must admit that one-half-cent per piece sounds mighty low and reasonable, especially when the main arguments are concerning 3-cent postcards, 5-cent letters, and other increases of 50 percent and 60 percent. But let's examine exactly what it does mean to small-in-size per issue publications.

Then Mr. Sweet mentions Capper publications and other farm newspapers in our section, including those published in Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, and Oklahoma. He says:

This number makes it sound "big and prosperous," but, actually, it is 12 or 16 pages per issue, tabloid newspaper size, and printed on newsprint. But the readers love it.

I am referring to the Capper publications—for instance, to Capper's Farmer. We might just as well have the benefit of their figures.

I read further from the letter:

For the year of 1957 its second-class postage was 50 percent above the minimum per piece. If this bill is passed with a one-half-cent minimum, the increase will not be approximately 45 percent to 50 percent, as apparently intended by the pound-rate increase, but will be 170 percent, and that immediately the bill goes into effect.

I wonder whether the Senator from Oklahoma will help me on this point.

Mr. MONRONEY. Capper's Weekly is not published by a nonprofit organization, is it? It is a commercial enterprise.

Mr. CARLSON. That is true.

Mr. MONRONEY. So it is not affected by the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. That amendment affects only the so-called nonprofit organizations.

There has also been misinformation regarding the application of the commercial rates. A publication of 5, 6, or 8 pages will be charged, on the advertising matter it carries, according to the schedule included in the bill. I do not believe Capper's Weekly would weigh less than

1 ounce; but, if it did, it would be handled as second-class matter at the one-half-cent rate. Certainly I do not believe any second-class publication should be delivered for less than one-half a cent. We discussed this point yesterday.

Mr. CARLSON. That is true.

Mr. MONRONEY. The proposal we supported was to raise the rate to one-half a cent on commercial publications and one-half of that for nonprofit publications. The Senate can increase the rate on nonprofit publications from one-eighth cent to one-fourth cent by rejecting the Carroll amendment, which would reestablish the free ride voted by the House of Representatives for the publications of charitable, religious, scientific, agricultural, labor, fraternal, and other organizations not organized for profit. The list includes practically all groups except the Rotary Clubs, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the National Association of Manufacturers, which have been excluded because they were definitely mentioned in a House report.

But the American Bar Association is still receiving a free ride; and so is the American Medical Association—the association of the poor, poor doctors. We are still forcing on them a 1/8-cent rate. The teamsters union, which seems to have money enough to do almost everything, would still have the benefit of the 1/8-cent rate. So would the following: American Rifle Association.

The Daughters of the American Revolution.

The Alabama Pythian.

The Athenian.

The Masonic Monthly.

The Alabama Farmer.

The Alabama Business Woman.

The Alabama Sheriffs and Police Journal.

The Insurance Council Journal.

The Southern Medical Journal.

The Alabama Club Woman.

Bulletin of the Albertus Magnus Guild.

Alabama Retail Trade.

Alabama Review.

Land of Cotton.

Air Force Historian.

Alabama Brass.

Bama Postmaster.

Keystone Post Office Clerk.

Alabama Social Welfare.

Alabama White Ribbon.

The Contender.

The Herald.

News & Views.

Anniston Star.

Plainsman.

The Builder.

Bulletin.

Huntress.

Newsletter.

Your News Letter.

Alabama Messenger.

The Southern Union News.

Mountain Messenger.

McCoy Weekly-Bulletin.

Royal Service.

Sunbeam Activities.

Childhaven News.

Dauphin Way News.

The Gothic Tower.

Abintonian.

The Canary.

Sweet Charity.

The Sanctuary News.

We simply went through most of those listed under the letter "A"; we did not go further. There are 6,000 in the list.

So we are going to bleed and suffer for these publications; and we are going to say that it would be vicious to charge them a 100 percent increase in their rate, by raising it from one-eighth of a cent to one-quarter of a cent!

Mr. President, the Senate has voted to have a 5-cent rate charged for the users of first-class mail. But this amendment would allow any of this very large group of publications and about 5,950 more to mail 40 copies, to be delivered by the same postman, up the same front walk—40 copies of this sort of stuff—for the rate a housewife would be charged to mail one letter to her son.

Mr. President, I do not think further hearings are needed; I believe the Senate has sufficient intelligence to know what to do in this matter.

If I had my way, I would have raised the rate to 1 cent. But if we adopt this amendment we are bound by the old rate; the rate is frozen at one-eighth of a cent for the publications of all these groups.

We believe the rate should be increased to one-quarter of a cent for the publications of all these groups. When the conference is held, the conferees will have to consider the one-eighth cent rate versus the one-fourth cent rate. Perhaps they will arrive at a compromise of three-sixteenths of a cent. Even so, no doubt we would still hear loud cries by the representatives of the same groups.

No wonder the American Bar Association and the American Medical Association seem to doubt the capacity of Congress to conduct the business of the country, when we have been allowing their publications to be mailed at these ridiculous rates.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Does the Senator from Oklahoma think the resolutions adopted by the American Bar Association are more intelligible and represent a greater degree of intelligence than do the resolutions adopted by the Senate?

Mr. MONRONEY. Unfortunately, I am one of the few Members of the Senate who is not a lawyer. Therefore, I could be considered antilawyer on this particular point.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say. If the Senate is ready to vote, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President—

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado wishes me to do so, I shall withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to speak to the same

audience the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has had.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished friend and colleague.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oklahoma desire to suggest the absence of a quorum at this time, in order to expedite the action of the Senate on the amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. That was my purpose. But if the Senator from Colorado desires it, I shall be glad to ask for a quorum call at this time, so as to enlarge the audience. I very rarely draw a large audience in the Senate, but I shall be very glad to have a larger audience to hear the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank my colleague, but that will not be necessary.

Mr. President, I do not think it will take long to respond to the Senator from Oklahoma. Today, he has taken another path. Yesterday, I was charged with being the champion of the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and similar groups. However, I have pointed out that they will not be covered by this law.

But today I am charged with being the champion of all the Alabama nonprofit publications; and now the Senator from Oklahoma has even charged me with being the spokesman for the Canary publication. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, speaking seriously, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has put his finger on what I conceive to be a very glaring problem. We have not previously discussed it. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is correct in this instance.

Mr. President, do you realize what it costs the Government, what it costs the taxpayers, to have the publications of these religious, scientific, philanthropic, and educational groups handled at such low mailing rates? This subsidy costs the taxpayers \$55 million.

However, Mr. President, do you know what this very eminent committee has voted to do in the case of these publications? It has voted to increase by \$2 million the amount they have been paying. Although it could be argued that they should have been hit with a meat ax, they actually have been hit with a powder puff. [Laughter.]

The bill as it stands actually places an oppressive rate burden on certain small groups of nonprofit publications and might drive them out of existence. The rate increase proposed in the Senate bill would amount in additional revenue to \$2 million, and that is the subject of our debate. That \$2 million increase, when applied to the religious, labor, fraternal, and farm groups—not necessarily the American Bar Association or the medical or dental associations—might drive the publications of those small groups out of existence.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, on that point, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I shall yield after I complete this statement.

On Wednesday the position of the distinguished junior Senator from Okla-

homa [Mr. MONRONEY] was that, aside from the publications of religious and similar groups, he was opposed to having other publications delivered for one-eighth of a cent. If so, it is proper to infer from his statement that he was in favor of the lower, or present, rate for the publications of the religious, scientific, charitable, and educational groups.

I read now from the statement made by the junior Senator from Oklahoma, as it appears on page 2488 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 26:

I cannot reconcile the continued attempt to shift to the general taxpayer the cost of handling publications, aside from religious, scientific, and educational ones.

The junior Senator from Oklahoma has to be consistent in his concept. It is the religious, scientific, and educational publications that we are talking about. We are not talking about any other groups, but the groups that come in a category which has been recognized, under law and under regulation, since 1925.

I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma when he says there has been a lot of free loading.

Furthermore, I gather from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma there is nothing static about the proposal under consideration. The Senator from Oklahoma has said in debate, "We will examine this from year to year." All we ask, in this examination, is that some of the persons who are being affected today by the change in second-class nonprofit rates be given an opportunity to be heard. We have no more information than does the Senator from Oklahoma. I may say the committee has insufficient information on the effect of this section of the bill. I think the distinguished Senator from Kansas put his finger on the problem when he stated that the committee is confused. It is confused because its members do not know the true effect of this section of the bill. They do not know because there were no hearings. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma will admit the truth of that statement because this question has never been fully and comprehensively considered by the committee itself.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Colorado will yield, I wish to say he has quoted me correctly in what I said in the original debate. I was speaking of the minimum rate per piece. In informal discussions with my friend, I think I have shown him that most of these publications, if they consist of nonadvertising material—which is true of 80 or 90 percent of the magazines—would enjoy rates less than those they are now paying. If the Senator will examine the schedule, he will see that to be so.

As I pointed out yesterday, one of the wealthiest churches in Washington sends out over 60,000 pieces of mail, over a 40-week period a year, and pays only \$5 for that service. I am in favor of increased rates for that kind of service.

If we adopt the Senator's proposal, we shall kill the application of the bulk rate provision. The larger publications

of churches, labor organizations, agricultural organizations, and educational fields would have their rates raised to a cent and a half a pound, instead of the rate now paid of a cent and a quarter a pound.

The magazine which is sent to the railroad brotherhood members is the only specific example which has been mentioned which would be affected by the increase in the minimum per piece rate.

However, I think we can increase the rate from one-eighth of a cent to one-quarter of a cent, which is an increase of 100 percent, on the basis of the general knowledge we all have that we are now allowing freeloading, even though for charitable purposes when we allow to be delivered 60,000 pieces of mail, in a 40-week period, for \$5, when at the same time the Senate has voted to charge 5 cents for a letter a mother may write to her son in college. I do not think we ought to raise the rate on letter mail to 5 cents and then allow an organization to deliver large quantities of mail without an increased charge.

Mr. CARROLL. Not only have I been placed in the lap of the Alabama canary bulletins, but now it is said I am placed in the position of being against a mother's sending a letter to her son, as a result of my amendment. I think the facts are simple, and it seems to me everyone should understand how simple the issue is. Two million dollars is involved.

I appreciate the gentle solicitude which the Senator from Oklahoma has for mothers who wish to send letters to their sons in college, but that is not the issue before the Senate. The issue is this: before we drive out of existence nonprofit publications which disseminate scientific, educational, labor, and veterans' publications, they are entitled to be heard.

Whether the bill goes back to the House with a freezing of the provisions of the bill, I suggest that my amendment is sufficiently flexible to enable the Senate to have an opportunity to negotiate with the other body.

I should like to make one further comment in closing, and then I shall be ready for a vote on the amendment. The bill is very involved. The formula is so complicated that the committee and the staff did not clearly understand its implications. They did not know the bill would impose a severe increase upon certain nonprofit publications, associations to which I have previously referred.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. Does the amendment of the Senator propose to change subsection (b) on page 36 to conform to the House provision?

Mr. CARROLL. That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. I commend the Senator. I spoke on this matter yesterday. I believe his amendment should be adopted.

I also should like to ask the Senator if his amendment covers subsection (c), near the bottom of page 36 of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. It is difficult for me to hear what the Senator is saying.

Mr. BARRETT. I was asking the Senator if his amendment also included the provision relating to subsection (c) at the bottom of page 36.

Mr. CARROLL. My two amendments, considered en bloc, do take care of the situation to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, this has been for me a very enlightening experience. I have had the counsel and guidance of the Senator from Oklahoma, who has done excellent work in the debate and on the bill. I think the RECORD ought to show that if the Senate should adopt the amendment it could be said to be the consensus of the Senate that, rather than resort to the old system, under the old law, the conferees should give consideration to the percentage rate formula as contained in the bill.

Evidently the Post Office Department and the committee itself seek to establish a percentage base for computing the rate. There is no objection to that, if it will provide uniformity, so long as there is an adherence to the basic concept of the law and regulations as now written which give a historic privileged treatment to nonprofit publications.

However, that formula could be substituted in the future, I may say to the committee members and the staff, if we will permit some of these people to have a hearing, so that they will know what to expect and so that they can present their arguments and evidence to the Senate for consideration. We can make a change in 3 months, 6 months, or a year, as the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma said in the debate.

What is wrong with a fair hearing? That is due process. We are perhaps driving some nonprofit publications out of existence. We should give them a hearing. That is the answer.

Again I repeat, as a final statement, there is \$2 million involved, out of a deficit of \$55 million. We are presented with a piecemeal raise, while the impression is given that considerable progress is being made.

Mr. President, if there is no further discussion on this matter, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments, en bloc, to the committee amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], on behalf of himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from

Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—35

Aiken	Humphrey	Mundt
Barrett	Jackson	Murray
Beall	Javits	Neuberger
Bricker	Kefauver	Pastore
Bridges	Kennedy	Potter
Butler	Kuchel	Proxmire
Carroll	Langer	Revercomb
Case, N. J.	Magnuson	Talmadge
Clark	Malone	Thurmond
Cotton	Mansfield	Wiley
Douglas	McNamara	Yarborough
Green	Morse	

NAYS—49

Allott	Gore	Payne
Bennett	Hayden	Purtell
Bible	Hill	Robertson
Bush	Hoblitzell	Russell
Carlson	Holland	Saltonstall
Case, N. Dak.	Hruska	Scott
Church	Jenner	Smathers
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kerr	Sparkman
Eastland	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Lausche	Thye
Ervin	Long	Watkins
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Frear	McClellan	Young
Fulbright	Monroney	
Goldwater	Morton	

NOT VOTING—12

Anderson	Curtis	Martin, Iowa
Byrd	Hennings	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Chavez	Ives	Symington

So Mr. CARROLL's amendments to the committee amendment were rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendments were rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yesterday the Senate adopted an amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] which, to describe

it briefly, provides a special local mailing rate for third-class mail. At the time the able Senator from New York was sponsoring his amendment I asked him certain questions, because I had some doubt about the amendment. I asked him if it could be subject to doubt and that it could be used by large corporations or firms which engage in circularizing through the mails. With his customary candor, the Senator from New York said he was not fully familiar with all the implications of the amendment, but hoped that it would not be subject to abuse.

I have since taken the matter up with the Post Office Department, and I have learned from the Department that it can be susceptible to very extensive abuse.

This involves a basic question affecting the postal rate bill, and it seems to me that all Senators should have the opportunity to hear what the issues are and what is involved at this time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I wish to compliment my distinguished colleague from Oregon for catching the implications which, I am sure, the Senate did not understand at the time it voted to adopt the amendment. It would effectively negate the Senate's action, through its committee, in providing a 2½-cent rate, in 2 stages, on the direct mail advertising, or, as some have unkindly referred to it, junk mail.

The amendment was adopted with the understanding that it would apply only in a limited way. The Senator from Oregon asked these questions when the amendment was under debate:

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is his amendment drafted in such a way that it will apply only to firms which send out a limited number of pieces of third-class mail?

Mr. JAVITS. That is my understanding of the study the staff of the committee made—that it was directed to that kind of mail.

After we studied it, we found it will be of greatest advantage to mailers who send out huge volumes of mail. They will be the only ones who will package and sort such mail. That is the effect of the amendment. During the discussion of the amendment on the floor, my distinguished colleague from New York apparently was not fully advised of the effect of the amendment, and thought it was limited. However, we find now that it opens wide the doors to such users as Sears Roebuck, Montgomery Ward, and others:

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Oklahoma is absolutely correct. What I was afraid of at the time I questioned the distinguished Senator from New York yesterday has now developed to be the fact.

Very early this morning I got in touch with the officials of the Post Office Department about this matter, and they have communicated to me a series of five reasons which they have headlined "Arguments Against Local Third-Class Mail." I shall read the statement in a moment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. The able Senator from New York will agree with me that in courtesy to him, as soon as I studied the matter, I communicated with his office. I believe he will concur in the statement that he has been fully informed in advance of my intention.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding any request I may make, the Senator from Oregon may not lose his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe it would be unfair to the proposal we have before us, which is a very important one, to debate it under the guise under which it has been presented. I am more than willing to debate it on its merits. The presentation of the facts as I have heard them are not in accord with the facts as I understand them. No Senator in the Chamber will ever say that any colleague has not been fully advised or does not understand entirely a proposal—and that includes me—and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the action taken yesterday in approving my amendment may be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], I offer a modified amendment. I ask that the amendment be read; then we can have a discussion of it on the merits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 38, line 20, it is proposed to strike out the word "and."

On page 38, in line 24, after the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the word "and."

On page 38, after line 24, it is proposed to add the following:

(C) by inserting before the colon at the end of such proviso a comma and the following: "and except that any such minimum charge per piece when mailed at the principal address of the mailer for delivery by the post office at which it is mailed on or after July 1, 1959, shall be 2 cents if the pieces are sorted, faced, and tied into packages labeled to postal delivery zones."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask my colleague from Oregon, in the same spirit in which we have both approached this little problem, if he will now allow me to present the amendment and the arguments for it, so that we may have an orderly presentation, rather than to have the arguments against it, or whatever arguments there may be against it, first?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield for that purpose, which is certainly justifiable.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Bear in mind, in the first place, that in this Chamber we are always working against deadlines. The bill was to have

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2711

been finished day before yesterday, then yesterday, and now, I assume, today. I had intended to make four speeches this week. This has been a banner week for me. I have had to cancel all 4, 1 after an abortive airplane effort to make it. So a Senator always feels, when he arrives in the morning, that unless he does something right away, it will not be done.

Therefore, under some pressure, I undertook to do something which my tremendous constituent mail—and that, I think, of many other Senators—dictated should deserve the attention of the Senate.

What can we do, not for the big mailer; not everybody in the world is a big mailer; not everybody in the world is a Montgomery Ward or a Sears Roebuck. There happen to be 4,300,000 businesses in the United States, of which roughly 4 million are small businesses. What can we do for the grocer, the upholsterer, the laundry man, and all the other merchants in a community, such as mine in New York, who cannot advertise in the New York Times, the Herald Tribune, the Mirror, or the News, without going broke, but who can depend only on direct mail? To some persons, this may be junk mail; however, to those merchants it is their very life blood. They cannot remain in business than by resort to advertising in that way.

So I asked myself, how can we take care of the situation for those people consistent with the traditions of the Post Office rate-making structure? That brings me to the reason for the specific freeze of the rate for that kind of mail at 2 cents, instead of letting it go up to 2½ cents.

What we are doing in passing upon this bill is to say that the rate on local mail shall be 4 cents and out-of-town mail shall be 5 cents. Heretofore the rate on that mail has been 3 cents.

The third-class rate for the small people whom I am describing, of whom there are millions throughout the Nation, was one-half the first-class rate.

Is it not logical, therefore, to say to these desirable beneficiaries of our equitable interest, "You now have a 4-cent local rate. So we will keep the relationship and make the rate for you 2 cents instead of 2½ cents. That is not out of line."

So I made an effort, so far as one could who is not a member of the committee, who is not aware of all the ins and outs of postal rate-making, by consulting with the committee staff. That was apparently inadequate, as seemed to be indicated when the matter was considered here yesterday.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] suggested to me that I ought to talk to the Post Office authorities. I did so. They suggested some additional language—three additional words—which would make it crystal clear that the proposal was intended to apply to local mail.

So by unanimous consent I inserted the provision in the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When the Senator offered his amendment yesterday, it was accepted, because I talked with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and he recommended that it be accepted. Something had to be done.

After the mail is brought into the post-offices and sorted, it will be found that its handling has cost a great deal of money, far more than one-half cent. The bill under consideration increases the rate to 1 cent—to a half cent the first year and another half cent the second year.

When the 1-cent rate goes into effect—not the one-half cent rate, but the 1-cent rate—we say to the mailer, "If you will do the work of bundling for the Post Office, you will not be charged the second half cent."

I thought, as did the other Members with whom I talked, that the Post Office would save a great deal of money by not having to do the additional work.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his contribution to the discussion. What he has said bears out exactly what I have in mind.

This morning, when the question arose again, I went to the experts of the Post Office Department, and I asked, "Can you cut this down to the barest limit in which you possibly can write it in order to make crystal clear what we are trying to do?" Hence this modification.

I told the Senator from Oregon I would never wish any Senator to feel unhappy about an amendment he had consented to, and that I would be glad to have the action on my original amendment reconsidered, so as to have the matter considered de novo.

That brings me to the amendment which is now at the desk and upon which the Senate will be asked to act. As I understand, it now makes the matter crystal clear. It provides that when mail by a mailer is sorted, faced, and tied into packages and is labeled with postal delivery zones, and delivered to a particular post office, if that post office makes the distribution of the mail which is so delivered to it, then the rate shall be frozen at 2 cents instead of 2½ cents.

Let me illustrate that, so that it will be clear. A merchant sorts and faces his mail. That is, it is all faced the same way. Then he ties it into bundles and puts tags on it for such and such a delivery zone for the particular package. He takes it to the post office.

If the same post office distributes the mail, it goes at the 2-cent rate instead of at the 2½-cent rate.

So my proposal endeavors to take care of the small people—and we all have them as constituents, and we have all heard from them.

What is the objection to this? The objection on the part of the Post Office Department is that they want the maximum revenue. The bill provides 2½ cents as the maximum. If the post office can get agreement to a 2½-cent rate in the Senate, this provision will not be in conference; that will be the end of it. The post office will be home free. I do not think we can lose too much sleep over their position. Certainly they want 2½

cents. They want everything they can get to help reduce the deficit. But we are concerned with individual equities.

The second argument against my proposal is that Montgomery Ward, Sears, Roebuck, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.—I do not use these names invidiously—can give a bunch of circulars to a small merchant who can mail them at the 2-cent rate. I should like to know what is wrong with that. How can the small merchants remain in business if they are not given some opportunity to fight the battle competitively for themselves?

Finally, it is said that the big mailer might go to the trouble of trucking mail to a particular post office and letting the post office distribute it. If, economically, it is cheaper for the mailer to do the trucking than to have the Post Office Department do it, what is wrong with that? In short, one cannot guarantee, when he is trying to do something fundamentally equitable, against every contingency in life.

That, as I see it, is what the opposition to the amendment is based on. But, again, I point out that the traditional equity of this position is that the mailer of third-class matter has always paid half the rate of first-class mail. This is what I am trying to do for one small part of the total amount of third-class mail involved.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I should like to have one point made plain in my mind. Under the Senator's amendment, does the sender have to have his office in the town or in the post office region from which his mail is sent? In other words, can one bundle his mail and go from town to town or post office to post office to have it sent off?

Mr. JAVITS. The Post Office Department has drawn this amendment exactly to the contrary, for it provides that—

When mailed at the principal address of the mailer for delivery by the post office at which it is mailed.

In short, the answer to the question is "No." It has to be mailed at the principal address of the mailer.

I have pointed out that in the case of individual merchants, such merchants will paste little labels with their addresses on the pieces of mail, and will send them in that way.

I believe the Senate should decide, advisedly, that that is not bad; that, instead, it is good, in terms of changing from mass distribution to small distribution.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the concern of the Senator from New York for the small-business men in the cities. But I should like to point out that many small-business men do not live in the cities where their customers live. I am thinking particularly of many small-business men in small towns in New England, who depend upon customers in New York City for their business. They often sell the same things that both

the small-business men and the big-business men in the cities sell.

It seems to me that under this amendment the city brethren would have the advantage in appealing to their customers.

Undoubtedly, the Senator from New York is aware of the innumerable number of small mail-order business which have developed in the rural areas. In the areas where they are located, they do not have enough customers to be able to have their business amount to anything. Those businesses must deal with customers in the large cities—for instance, in New York City.

This amendment would give a businessman who remained in a city—instead of moving to Putney, Vt., to conduct his business—a considerable advantage.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course, in connection with these matters we proceed on the basis of the doctrine of *de minimis*, as we lawyers say.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Just as I have pointed out that we cannot base the bill on the mailing of material on which the sender places his imprimatur. Yet, I recognize that these are aspects of a fringe situation which, fundamentally, is a small-business problem.

I am not offering the amendment as being 100 percent perfect. I am offering it as being perhaps only 85 or 90 percent a reasonable answer. That is the best I can say.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New York for looking after his own constituents. However, I should like to have my constituents have an opportunity to do as much business as possible with persons living in New York City and the surrounding suburbs.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, let me point out that I am not attempting to look out for only my own constituents.

Mr. AIKEN. I realize that.

Mr. JAVITS. This measure affects the people living in cities of even moderate size; it is not confined to the problem facing my constituents.

Mr. AIKEN. But if the rate is to be based on the willingness of the sender of the mail to sort it into parcels of 10 or more pieces which are going to a single post office, I believe it should apply to those who live outside the cities, as well as to those who live in the cities.

I have some idea of what I am talking about, because for many, many years I mailed from 20,000 to 30,000 pieces of mail. I always sorted them, because I thought I had to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe the amendment should be brought to a vote. On the question of agreeing to my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. First, Mr. President, I withdraw my request for the yeas and nays. I shall renew it after I have yielded to the Senator from Kentucky and after he has finished the question he wishes to ask.

Mr. COOPER. Has the Senator from New York been able to obtain an estimate of the cost of the bill without his amendment and of the cost of the bill with his amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad the Senator from Kentucky has asked that question.

Mr. President, may there be order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let there be order in the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, those of us who sit on this side of the Chamber were unable to hear whether the yeas and nays were ordered, following the request for the yeas and nays. There is so much disorder in the Chamber that I do not think even an explosion of Mount Vesuvius could be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York withdrew his request for the yeas and nays. Whenever the yeas and nays are requested the Chair will put the question.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there is now a moment of quiet; so on the question of agreeing to my amendment, I now request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York. On this question the yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thought the able Senator from New York was asked about the comparative amounts of revenues to be obtained, first, under the bill as it now stands and, second, under the bill with the inclusion of his amendment. I refer to the comparative amounts of revenue coming to the Government.

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand, these increases will aggregate \$43 million. The best answer I can get from the representative of the Post Office Department is that this amendment would affect one-fourth of that total.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In what way?

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, if the rate is frozen at 2 cents, the maximum diminution in the return would be 25 percent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In other words, the bill proposes a revenue increase in the amount of \$43 million, from this source; is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the amendment of the Senator from New York, approximately \$10 million would be lost; is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, \$10 million. That is my understanding from the figures the Post Office Department representatives have given me.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. This amendment has to do with the so-called junk mail; does it not?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; or advertising circulars.

Mr. BUSH. Circulars addressed to boxholders; is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. Under the amendment, such mail would have to be sorted and directed to particular post-office areas.

Mr. BUSH. But it could be addressed to boxholders, could it?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. In my State there are many small weekly newspapers which are dependent upon serving the people of the areas in which they are published. Unless such newspapers can carry some advertising, they cannot exist.

Among the people in my area there has been much objection to the so-called junk mail. If the amendment is agreed to, I understand the bill will be more favorable to junk mail than otherwise. In other words, the bill is designed to increase the rate on junk mail. But is not the amendment of the Senator from New York designed to reduce the rate?

Mr. JAVITS. My amendment is designed to cut the rate back in the case of a particular kind of mailer who needs such help. In other words, the bill would not eliminate what the Senator from Connecticut calls junk mail. The only question is what shall be paid for handling it; and even the maximum proposed will not be so prohibitive, in terms of those who mail very large quantities, that they would cut down materially their volume of mail. I do not think we are dealing with the situation in such a way as to put a stop to such mail.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I understand that I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from New York, to permit him to make a statement. It is my hope that prompt action will be taken on the postal rate bill, and that then the postal pay bill will be brought before the Senate. If that is to be done, we must terminate this discussion, and must come to a vote.

I should like to have an opportunity to comment on the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be glad to take my seat until the Senator from Oregon shall have finished, if he prefers that I do so.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to say, briefly, that although the amendment of the Senator from New York may have been drafted by the Post Office Department, I am authorized to inform the Senate—I am authorized by the Postmaster General himself—that he would prefer that this amendment not be included in the bill.

In my opinion the amendment would provide a loophole so big that a 4-unit diesel locomotive could pass through it.

Let us see what the effect of the amendment would be. Is the amendment designed to be of help to a small upholsterer? If such a businessman sends out a thousand pieces of mail, the amendment would reduce his mailing bill by \$5. But under the amendment, R. H. Macy & Co. could send out 6 million or 7 million pieces of mail and could also enjoy the reduced rate.

Similarly, if a Buick dealer in Boise, Idaho—let us say the Church Buick Co.,

although we know that our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Idaho, is not in the automobile business—wished to send out a large amount of mail, General Motors Corp. would be able to ship to that company innumerable circulars; and so long as they were stamped with the name of Church Buick Agency, for instance, they could be mailed at the reduced rate, from Boise, under this amendment.

Mr. President, the Senate has voted that the rate on first-class mail going out of town shall be 5 cents, and that the rate on first-class mail sent locally shall be 4 cents.

It seems to me that the Senate ought not to open up such a vast loophole in the third-class rate. That is why I raised some questions yesterday. That is why in my opinion the amendment of the able Senator from New York should be rejected. In view of the substantial increases voted on first-class mail rates, I doubt if we should open a loophole to weaken the committee position on third-class mail rates.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We have been discussing today an overabundance of junk mail being delivered to homes. Would this type of amendment permit the delivery of junk mail?

Mr. NEUBERGER. This amendment, if adopted, would permit so-called junk mail, if the Senator from Ohio wishes to apply that label to it, to be sent to homes in the United States at the reduced rate of 2 cents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* the reasons sent to me by the Post Office Department for their opposition to local third-class mail.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

ARGUMENTS AGAINST LOCAL THIRD-CLASS MAIL

1. Large mailers would simply haul their circular material to the local post office and pay only the 2-cent rate.

2. Would complicate the third-class rate structure which already has piece rates, pound rates, and special rates for nonprofit organizations.

3. The Javits amendment establishes a local rate only for bulk mailings. If this principle were applied with consistency, it would then be necessary to establish a local rate for piece mailings. This would further reduce the revenues the Department would receive from the third-class rate adjustments at a very time when Congress is attempting to establish more equitable cost relationships in this class of mail.

4. At the present date bulk mailings of certain nonprofit organizations are subject to a 1-cent minimum per piece. Pressures would mount from these organizations, and perhaps rightly so if we are to be consistent in our ratemaking, for the establishment of an even lower local rate for their mailings. This, too, would reduce revenues from the proposals now before us.

5. Third-class mail is already receiving a substantial discount from the first-class mail rates. In the past Congress has never made a rate differential on third-class mail based on local and nonlocal mailings, and for good reason. The uniform rates have always been low enough without giving further concessions to large third-class mail users in the form of a still lower rate for local matter.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for himself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered. Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will withdraw his request. The Senate will vote on the matter, if Senators will give us a chance to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and renew my request for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I thought there was certainly a showing of a sufficient number of hands.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that it takes a showing of 17 hands. Only 16 hands were counted.

Mr. SMATHERS. Here is the 17th.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. It takes only one-fifth of Senators present to have the yeas and nays ordered, does it not?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that it is not in order to keep repeating requests for the yeas and nays without business intervening between the requests.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I dislike to see the Senate functioning in this way. We know there is a substantial number of Senators on the floor. The Senator from New York indicated he was going to speak for a few moments. I urged the Senator from Oregon to let us vote. He has spoken and has provoked the Senator from New York to speak now. When the Senator from New York completes his statement, another Senator will speak. We can have quorum calls, and take a great deal of time this evening, and stay here tonight, and come back tomorrow. I think most Senators know what the sentiment is on the amendment. I think the Senator from Delaware well realizes that, but if the Senator is determined to have a yeas-and-nays vote on this amendment, I shall be glad to accede to his request for a call of the roll on this and every other little amendment, but we shall be here until all hours.

I think the result of the vote on the amendment will show, when Senators come to the Chamber from their offices, and when the roll is called, that a yeas-and-nays vote was not necessary to get the action the Senator from Delaware desires; but if it will please him to have a rollcall, and if the Senator is going to insist upon having a quorum call, we can have one.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays. Let us have the yeas and nays ordered, so we can then look at the result.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this is an amendment which would obviously cut back the proposed increase on so-called junk mail; I am very much opposed to this amendment. Having authorized an increase in first-class postage, I think it would be inexcusable to adopt the amendment and thereby reduce the rate on the "junk" mail.

I appreciate the fact that the Senator from New York asked for a reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to last night. I think that was very fair of him, but I want to be sure the Senate is on record on the amendment this time. I hope it will be defeated.

Certainly the time is long past due when rates on "junk" mail should be increased.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which I shall ask to have considered later. I want Senators to be thinking about it. I hope we can agree to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Were the yeas and nays ordered?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays were not ordered on the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I thought they were.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I renew the request for the yeas and nays.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. I ask Senators to please hold their hands up long enough so they can be accurately counted.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed order which has been sent to the desk.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That debate on the postal pay amendment, and all amendments or motions thereto, to H. R. 5836, an act to readjust postal rates and to establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates, and for other purposes, be limited to 1 hour of debate to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of the amendment and the majority leader: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said amendment shall be received.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to say, by way of explanation, that I have discussed this matter with the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee. They informed me they do not think any more than 1 hour will be required on the postal pay amendment or any amendment thereto. The order provides for 1 hour on any amendment, or any motion, or amendment thereto. Since we are going to have several rollcalls, since this is Friday, since we would like to avoid a Saturday session if possible, and since we expect this to be the last amendment to the rate part of the bill, if Senators are agreeable, I

should like them to consider having this order entered, so all Senators may be on notice we are going to have reasonable debate, but that we also expect to have several rollcalls. I hope we can complete action on the bill, so we will not have to consider having a session on Saturday.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I am willing that there be a limited debate, but I wonder if we should not first have a quorum call, because a Senator may complain later that he was not advised of the limited-debate proposal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that would be appropriate.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. Can the Senator inform me how late the Senate is going to stay in session tonight?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to have the Senate conclude as early as possible. How long Senators will take, I have long ago given up trying to guess. I am not going to repeat the mistake I made last night and the night before, by saying we do not expect a rollcall after 6:30, because at about 5:30 Senators inform me they are going to speak and expect a rollcall.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is the proposed order limited to the proposed postal rate bill, or does it include proposals to increase the pay or salaries of postal workers?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The proposed order pertains to proposed amendments to the rate bill, involving postal pay increases, or any amendments, or any motions.

I will say to the Senator I wanted the Senate to be given a chance to consider the proposed order. Before we have the yeas and nays on the amendment in which the Senator from New York is interested, we shall have a quorum call, and then, either before or after the vote, we can have the clerk read the proposed order and the Senate can then consider it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Does the Senator mean that if salary increases are proposed in an amendment to the pending bill, debate on that proposal will be limited to 1 hour?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct. Does my friend have any suggestions?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The only suggestion I have is that I shall object to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas does not propose it at this time, but if the Senator from West Virginia thinks the time is too limited, or has any suggestions that will be helpful, I shall be glad to consider incorporating them in the order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the limit of debate that might arise on the salary increase proposal is too short.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The ranking minority member of the committee and the chairman of the committee thought the time proposed would be ample. Does the Senator think the time ought to be increased by another 30 minutes?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not propose any time, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would it be agreeable to the Senator if the time were increased by 30 minutes?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Not at this time. When the matter comes up I shall exercise my rights.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will give thought to it and make suggestions, I shall be glad to work out an agreement with him.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I certainly will give it some thought.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Morton
Allott	Hayden	Mundt
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Beall	Hill	Neuberger
Bennett	Hoblitzell	Pastore
Bible	Holland	Payne
Bricker	Hruska	Potter
Bridges	Humphrey	Proxmire
Bush	Jackson	Purtell
Butler	Javits	Revercomb
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Church	Kennedy	Smathers
Clark	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lausche	Talmadge
Dworshak	Long	Thurmond
Eastland	Magnuson	Thye
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ervin	Mansfield	Wiley
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Frear	McClellan	Yarborough
Fulbright	McNamara	Young
Goldwater	Monroney	
Gore	Morse	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we have order in the Chamber, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long. My only purpose in offering the amendment is to draw attention to a particular situation which has been called to the notice of all of us by the small-business men, who will, if the amendment is defeated, be placed in a position contrary to rather than for their interest with relation to the first-class mail rate.

The first-class mail rate of 5 cents is to be provided for only 3 years, yet the small-business man is being asked to accept a 50 percent proportion of that on a permanent basis and not for only 3 years.

We shall have a 4-cent rate for local mail, but we are not giving the small-business man the same relationship to local mail which he has traditionally had.

Senators may talk about junk mail, but I should like to see them discuss of such mail in terms of "junk" mail with their small business constituents. I do not think their constituents would take very kindly to that description, since many of them are men to whom it represents the staff of life.

I am very proud to be a Member of this body. It is a determined body. It is thorough. I think that is all to the good. I hope in perhaps my own small way I have made my contribution toward making it a thorough body today.

There is only one point of fact which I should like to emphasize in connection with the amendment I have proposed. The amendment does not range all the way, but it applies to the particular post office at which the mailer has his principal address, and to the mail distributed only through that post office. It seems to me that confines the application very closely, even confining it more closely than the 4-cent first-class mail. We shall have a 4-cent first-class mail rate for all 5 boroughs of New York City, but if the amendment I have proposed is adopted there will be a 2-cent rate on the third-class mail in only the Boroughs of Manhattan and the Bronx, which happen to have 1 post office. That rate is confined even beyond the 4-cent first-class rate.

I deeply feel the amendment deserves the support of Senators. The question can then be taken to conference and considered and discussed in connection with what was done by the House of Representatives.

I repeat, unless the Senate adopts the amendment, the rate will be fixed at 2½ cents, because the House bill provides 2½ cents, and without the amendment that would be the end of it. This is the last chance Senators will have to take this matter to conference. That is exactly the reason why the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member yesterday accepted this proposal. They knew what they were doing. They were not confused. They felt they ought to take the proposal to conference in order to determine what finally ought to be done with respect to the House bill.

If we do not adopt the amendment there will be no latitude whatever, and the bill will be absolutely tied down to

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2715

2½ cents. Senators are now called upon to vote "yea" or "nay" on whether the rate shall be fixed at 2½ cents.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPFEL] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPFEL] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 6, nays 79, as follows:

YEAS—6		
Beall	Case, N. J.	Kuchel
Butler	Javits	Morton
NAYS—79		
Alken	Hayden	Murray
Allott	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Barrett	Hill	Pastore
Bennett	Hoblitell	Payne
Bible	Holland	Potter
Bricker	Hruska	Proxmire
Bridges	Humphrey	Purtell
Bush	Jackson	Revercomb
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, S. C.	Saltonstall
Church	Kefauver	Scott
Clark	Kennedy	Smathers
Cooper	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lausche	Stennis
Dworshak	Long	Talmadge
Eastland	Magnuson	Thurmond
Ellender	Malone	Thye
Ervin	Mansfield	Watkins
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wiley
Frear	McClellan	Williams
Fulbright	McNamara	Yarborough
Goldwater	Monroney	Young
Gore	Morse	
Green	Mundt	
NOT VOTING—11		
Anderson	Curtis	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Hennings	Schoepfel
Capehart	Ives	Symington
Chavez	Martin, Iowa	

So Mr. JAVITS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in order that this question may not be reopened, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Javits amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 48, line 16, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following:

Provided, That funds for the purposes of this subsection shall be transferred to the General Services Administration to effectuate such purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am not disposed to labor the amendment, but I think it is necessary. We created the General Services Administration 9 years ago. It has authority over Federal supply, procurement, real estate, design of buildings, construction, and so forth. This amendment very properly belongs in the bill. The Administrator of the General Services Administration fully concurs in that viewpoint. That is the reason for offering the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this matter did not come before the committee during our discussion; neither has any committee member talked to me about it. I have no authority whatever to take any action on it. However, I suggest that we could possibly take the amendment to conference and consider it there, and determine what should be done about it. There are a great many ramifications connected with it.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the fact that the Senator will take it to conference. I, too, would like to look into it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am definitely opposed to taking the amendment to conference. I sincerely question its wisdom. If the distinguished Senator wishes to take it to conference, we should have a full-dress debate on it. I should like to state my reasons for opposing the amendment, and to urge that the provision for the \$175 million be stricken from the bill. I am associating myself in that view with the views of many members of the Committee on Public Works. The establishment of the fund is a violation of the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee. Therefore, if Senators wish to spend all afternoon in debating the subject, I suggest that the amendment be taken to conference after it has been fully debated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In offering to take it to conference, I am not agreeing to the amendment. However, there are a great many things in the bill that I did not agree to. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not intend for one moment to labor the subject. I believe it is the right course to follow. Under the proposal of the first Hoover Commission we consolidated all the procurement of supplies and construction of agencies in the GSA. That agency is carrying on that function today. If it is the desire of the Senate to thwart that activity and nullify it with respect to the \$175 million fund, that is perfectly all right with me. I merely do not want the opportunity to escape without raising my voice on the subject, because I shall be the last Member of the Senate to deviate from action the Senate took and which has had the concurrence of Congress and the country for the past 9 years.

If we examine the figures of GSA, it will be found that that agency is charged with procurement and design and acquisition of realty. The office in charge of the construction of public buildings is located there. That agency has supervision. Therefore the amendment should properly be in the bill. I am not asking for a show of hands, and I will not ask for a yea-and-nay vote; I merely wish to make my own position clear. If the House Members in conference should undertake to change it, that would be quite satisfactory to me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Although I am willing to take the amendment to conference, I must say that personally I am not in favor of it. There is nothing in the bill relating to it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has the amendment been withdrawn?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The sponsor of the amendment has withdrawn it.

Mr. KERR. What is the purpose—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from South Carolina has yielded to me for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was announcing that the amendment had been withdrawn. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I refer the Senator to section 303 on page 48 of the bill, which reads:

EXPENDITURE FROM FUND

SEC. 303. Moneys paid into the fund, together with any income thereof under section 304 (b), shall be available until expended for obligation by the Postmaster General for the purpose of—

(2) constructing or otherwise acquiring buildings and other related property which will more efficiently serve the needs of the postal service, and for improving existing facilities.

If that does not do two things, first, collect money and turn it over to the Postmaster General, and, second, make it available until expended for constructing or otherwise acquiring buildings and other related property, then what is the meaning of the language?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. All the testimony will bear out my statement that that was intended for the leasing of buildings and for the remodeling of present post offices in order to install modern equipment. It may be necessary, for example, to remove a partition, or to do something like that.

Mr. KERR. In view of the testimony of the Postmaster General which was read yesterday by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], does the Senator from South Carolina take the responsibility for telling us that when the words of an act give one authority and the testimony of the Postmaster General indicated a different purpose, the testimony of the Postmaster General is binding or that the language in the act is binding?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will take the language in the act as binding.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator look at the second paragraph in section 303 of the bill and tell the Senate that the bill does not provide for the collecting of the money and putting it into a fund which is made available to the Postmaster General for constructing or otherwise acquiring buildings and other related property which will more efficiently serve the needs of the postal service?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I want the Senator to know that I am not defending the provision.

Mr. KERR. I am asking the Senator what it means.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The only thing I know is what the testimony before the committee brought out.

Mr. KERR. I ask the Senator what the language in the bill means.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I suggest that the Senator ask the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I did not sponsor that provision at all. That was put in by amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator tell me what it means?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was against all of it. I suggest the Senator from Oklahoma ask the Senator from Kansas the question.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask the Senator from Kansas what the language means.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that paragraph (2)

of section 303, shown at lines 13 to 16, on page 48 of the bill, be stricken.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I join in the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas offer such an amendment?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the language be stricken.

Mr. CARLSON. I am asking unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the amend-

ment read or to have it printed in the RECORD?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not believe it is necessary to have it read. It has been on the desks of the Senators for many days. It is a committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

On page 49, after line 9, insert the following:

That the act entitled "Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955," approved June 10, 1955 (Public Law 68, 84th Congress), is hereby amended as follows:

(a) In section 301 (a) strike out the Postal Field Service Schedule, and insert the following schedule:

"Postal field service schedule"

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
1.....	\$3,095	\$3,205	\$3,315	\$3,425	\$3,535	\$3,645	\$3,755
Temporary rate.....	3,335	3,445	3,555	3,665	3,775	3,885	3,995
2.....	3,320	3,435	3,550	3,665	3,780	3,895	4,010
Temporary rate.....	3,560	3,675	3,790	3,905	4,020	4,135	4,250
3.....	3,580	3,705	3,830	3,955	4,080	4,205	4,330
Temporary rate.....	3,820	3,945	4,070	4,195	4,320	4,445	4,570
4.....	3,935	4,070	4,205	4,340	4,475	4,610	4,745
Temporary rate.....	4,175	4,310	4,445	4,580	4,715	4,850	4,985
5.....	4,170	4,305	4,440	4,575	4,710	4,845	4,980
Temporary rate.....	4,410	4,545	4,680	4,815	4,950	5,085	5,220
6.....	4,505	4,655	4,805	4,955	5,105	5,255	5,405
Temporary rate.....	4,665	4,815	4,965	5,115	5,265	5,415	5,565
7.....	4,870	5,035	5,200	5,365	5,530	5,695	5,860
Temporary rate.....	4,950	5,115	5,280	5,445	5,610	5,775	5,940
8.....	5,255	5,440	5,625	5,810	5,995	6,180	6,365
Temporary rate.....	5,675	5,875	6,075	6,275	6,475	6,675	6,875
9.....	6,235	6,450	6,665	6,880	7,095	7,310	7,525
Temporary rate.....	6,890	7,095	7,330	7,565	7,800	8,035	8,270
10.....	7,545	7,805	8,065	8,325	8,585	8,845	9,105
Temporary rate.....	8,310	8,590	8,870	9,150	9,430	9,710	9,990
11.....	9,140	9,440	9,740	10,040	10,340	10,640	10,940
Temporary rate.....	10,050	10,350	10,650	10,950	11,250	11,550	11,850
12.....	11,075	11,375	11,675	11,975	12,275	12,575	12,875
Temporary rate.....	12,255	12,555	12,855	13,155	13,455	13,755	14,055
13.....	13,760	14,060	14,360	14,660	14,960	15,260	15,560
Temporary rate.....	15,000	15,300	15,600	15,900			
14.....	16,000						

(b) In section 302 (a) strike out the Rural Carrier Schedule, and insert the following schedule:

"Rural carrier schedule"

	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum.....	\$1,841	\$1,896	\$1,951	\$2,006	\$2,061	\$2,116	\$2,171
Temporary rate.....	2,081	2,136	2,191	2,246	2,301	2,356	2,411
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route.....	65	67	69	71	73	75	77
For each mile of route over 30 miles.....	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum.....	1,841						
Temporary rate.....	2,081						
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route.....	65						
For each mile of route over 30 miles.....	22						
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)"

1 Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2717

(c) In section 302 (c) strike out "\$4,700" and insert "\$5,275 during the period referred to in section 304 (c) or \$5,035 thereafter."

(d) In section 303 (a) strike out the fourth-class office schedule and insert the following schedule:

"Fourth-class office schedule"

Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
\$1,300 to \$1,499.99.....	\$2,703	\$2,793	\$2,883	\$2,973	\$3,064	\$3,154	\$3,244
Temporary rate.....	2,829	2,923	3,017	3,111	3,207	3,301	3,395
\$900 to \$1,299.99.....	2,477	2,560	2,642	2,725	2,808	2,891	2,973
Temporary rate.....	2,592	2,679	2,765	2,852	2,939	3,025	3,111
\$600 to \$899.99.....	2,027	2,095	2,163	2,231	2,298	2,366	2,434
Temporary rate.....	2,121	2,192	2,264	2,335	2,405	2,476	2,547
\$350 to \$599.99.....	1,577	1,630	1,682	1,735	1,788	1,840	1,893
Temporary rate.....	1,650	1,706	1,760	1,816	1,871	1,926	1,981
\$250 to \$349.99.....	1,127	1,164	1,202	1,239	1,277	1,315	1,352
Temporary rate.....	1,179	1,218	1,258	1,297	1,336	1,376	1,414
\$200 to \$249.99.....	901	931	961	991	1,021	1,051	1,081
Temporary rate.....	943	974	1,006	1,037	1,069	1,100	1,131
\$100 to \$199.99.....	676	699	721	744	766	789	812
Temporary rate.....	707	732	755	779	802	826	850
Under \$100.....	450	465	481	496	511	526	541
Temporary rate.....	471	487	503	519	535	550	566

(e) In section 304 insert the following new subsection:

"(c) Wherever a temporary per annum rate is provided by a basic salary schedule contained in this title, such temporary rate shall be in effect, in lieu of the regular scheduled rate, for the period beginning on the effective date of this amendment and ending 3 years after such date."

SEC. 2. (a) The annual rate of basic salary of any officer or employee whose basic salary by reason of the provisions of section 504 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 is at a rate between two scheduled rates, or above the highest scheduled rate, in the postal field service schedule, the rural carrier schedule, or the fourth-class office schedule, whichever may be applicable, is hereby increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this act in the next lower rate in such schedule.

(b) As used in this section, the term "basic salary" has the same meaning as when used in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.

SEC. 3. No increase under the provisions of this act shall be construed to be an equivalent increase within the meaning of section 401 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act.

SEC. 4. The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized and directed to grant, effective as of October 1, 1957, increases in the compensation of postal employees of the Canal Zone Government comparable to those provided by this act for similar employees.

SEC. 5. This act shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

SEC. 6. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to a postmaster, officer, or employee who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1957, and ending on the date of enactment of this act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Cong.), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1957, and ending on the date of enactment of this act by a postmaster, officer, or employee who died during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from

training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. (a) This act shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1957.

(b) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of such enactment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, S. 27, the postal-pay bill, and S. 734, the classified-pay bill, were reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee last spring. They have been pending on the Senate Calendar since that time.

Each of these bills has been reconsidered by the committee in the light of current conditions. The committee has adopted a committee amendment which is not offered to H. R. 5836. In neither case does the committee amendment change materially the increases that will be provided by each bill. In due course the changes made by the committee amendment will be fully explained.

Mr. President, I think the Senate and our Federal employees should be aware of what a tremendous job it is to put together pay bills for such a large work force as we have in the Federal service. The subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], held long and exhaustive hearings last spring. They held many meetings and finally reported my bills to the full committee. The full committee spent many sessions going over the bills; and finally they were reported to the Senate. Unfortunately, the legislative situation that existed last year did not permit their being considered on the floor of the Senate.

Immediately upon the convening of Congress this year the subcommittee as-

sembled, and during the course of a series of meetings reconsidered the bills. The current thinking of the subcommittee was then presented to the full committee in the form of suggested committee amendments to the bills. The full committee promptly met and considered each amendment carefully.

Thus, I am in a position to state, without fear of contradiction, that the bills as proposed to be amended reflect the considered judgment of the committee as to what is equitable, what is fair, what is needed, and what is proper, if we are to do justice to our Federal employees.

Mr. President, it is difficult for me to understand how any fairminded person, in possession of all the facts, could possibly justify a position in opposition to the pending bills. I have been closely associated with matters of this kind for a good many years. Never, during that period of time, have I believed a pay increase more justified than at the present moment. As evidenced by the vote on the pay bills last year, the majority of Congress felt that the employees should have been given an increase at that time. An increase is even more justified today.

Both S. 27, the postal pay bill, and S. 734, the classified bill, provide a basic 7½-percent increase. In my opinion, this is completely inadequate. Certainly, the increase in the cost of living, which has occurred during recent years, justifies a greater increase. I personally would not be frightened or intimidated by the threat of another veto. Presidential vetoes have become "old hat" to those of us who have tried to deal fairly with our Federal employees. That being the case, I would be willing to vote for the kind of bill that I think is justified, and if it was vetoed, I would vote to override the veto. That is how I personally feel.

We passed a more liberal bill last year and sent it to the President. So far as I am concerned, I would again vote for the same kind of bill and send it back to him.

However, there are many who think the situation so desperate that it would be best to act on less liberal bills than are justified in order to assure their being approved by the President. That is the situation confronting us today as we are about to take up the pay bill.

The President recommended a 6-percent increase. It has been reported in the press that he will accept a 7½-percent increase, but that he will not accept anything above that figure. The classified bill certainly should be completely acceptable because it comes within that limit. The postal bill, while providing a 7½-percent increase to all employees, gives, in addition thereto, a small pitance to the lower paid employees. It gives \$240 a year to employees in the lower 5 levels, \$160 a year to employees in level 6, and \$80 a year to employees in level 7. These extra amounts were added because the employees in these levels serve in their jobs on a career basis. They enter the service as a clerk or carrier, and they retire 30 years later from the same job.

They do not have opportunity to advance. They are neighbors of yours and

neighbors of mine. They are substantial citizens of every community. They have families. Their children go to school with your children and with my children. They are deserving of a decent wage. The salary they are presently receiving is not decent, to my way of thinking. It is not sufficient for them to support their families. The 7½-percent basic increase, plus the small cost-of-living allowance, is all too little. I would like to see it much greater.

I do not understand how anyone can call it unreasonable or can claim that it will distort or throw out of line the pay schedule. Charges of that kind have no basis in fact. They are simple devices used to cloud the issue.

The real objection on the part of those who protest is that it will cost money. Certainly it will cost money. We cannot give \$1 to our postal employees without its costing one-half million dollars, because that is the number of employees in the postal service. When \$240 a year is added to the pay of 500,000 postal clerks and carriers, the bill cannot help being 240 times 500,000, but I am unwilling to let that sway me in my judgment of the merits of the case.

Mr. President, I think it only simple justice, long past due, that the amendments be adopted without modification.

I understand the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] will offer an amendment to eliminate the cost-of-living increase in the lower grades.

I appeal to the Senate to adopt the proposed amendment with one change, as follows:

Strike out "October 1, 1957," wherever it appears, and insert in lieu thereof "January 1, 1958."

The amendment to the amendment is offered on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and myself.

The original amendment provides that it shall become effective October 1, 1957. The amendment to the amendment provides that the effective date shall be January 1, 1958.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina it is proposed to strike out "October 1, 1957," wherever it appears, and insert in lieu thereof "January 1, 1958."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from South Carolina has asked unanimous consent that the original amendment be modified by the amendment he has just offered?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I want that understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina, for himself and other Senators, to the original amendment proposed by him.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] held all the hearings on the pay bill. He was the chairman of the subcommittee and was present at all the hearings. He will handle the amendment on the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the able chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. President, I shall be brief, because I believe the amendment is quite well understood by every Senator.

The amendment under consideration has been on the Senate Calendar since early last year. For that reason, and further because it is not particularly complex, I am confident it is rather well understood. On that premise, I shall at this point merely summarize briefly the amendment and then explain in somewhat greater detail the changes that will result by its adoption.

S. 27—the postal pay bill, which is the pending amendment—provides a permanent increase of 7½ percent to all employees in the postal service, except a handful in the top pay level who are now receiving the ceiling salary of \$16,000. In addition to the permanent increase of 7½ percent, a temporary cost-of-living adjustment is made in the lower 7 levels. Employees in the bottom 5 levels would be given an additional \$240 a year, employees in level 6 would receive an additional \$160 a year, and employees in level 7 an additional \$80 a year. The bill, as reported, would make the cost-of-living adjustments in the lower 7 levels continue for 2 years after the effective date of the increase. Also, the effective date would be "the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment."

As chairman of the subcommittee which drafted this bill, I am confident it is merited legislation.

The committee amendment makes but two substantive changes: First, it would continue the cost-of-living adjustments for 3 years instead of 2; second, with the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] which has just been adopted, it would make the increases effective with the first pay period commencing on or after January 1, instead of after the date of enactment. All other changes made by the amendment are of a technical nature necessary and customary in bills having a past rather than a future effective date.

Mr. President, I desire now to talk to three points. First, Why a pay raise? Second, Why the additional cost-of-living adjustment in the lower seven levels? Third, Why January 1 of this year has been made the effective date.

WHY A PAY RAISE?

During the course of long and searching public hearings held early last spring, an irrefutable case was made for an immediate increase in the pay of postal workers and other Federal employees. It was established clearly and convincingly that the pay of Federal employees has

not kept pace with the pay of their counterparts in private industry. Even more shocking was the evidence that the Government is, in many instances, paying its employees well below the minimum necessary to maintain themselves and their families in decency. This has caused many of our best employees to leave the Federal service and a large percentage of those who have stuck it out to obtain second and even third jobs on the outside in order to supplement their family rent and grocery funds. Every Member who sat through those hearings was convinced that such a situation is not fair; that it is a sorry reflection on Uncle Sam as an employer, and that it is not conducive of either efficiency or economy in the conduct of essential public services.

WHY THE ADDITIONAL COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT IN THE LOWER PAY LEVELS OF THE POSTAL SERVICE?

First, let us get one fact straight. The pay schedule for the postal field service is man-made. The schedule is not exactly what the administration and the Post Office Department first recommended to Congress. It is not precisely the same as approved in the House. Neither does it jibe fully with the schedule approved in the Senate. Certain changes were made here and there in the schedule at each step along the way before its enactment into law several years ago. I doubt that anyone was satisfied at the time of its enactment that it was completely equitable and satisfactory in every detail. I strongly suspect there was complete agreement on two points only. First, that it was a progressive piece of legislation, and, secondly, that from time to time as weaknesses in the schedule became apparent, they would be repaired by appropriate changes.

So let us put to rest the false myth—some opponents of the bill would have us believe—that the existing schedule is something sacred not to be touched or changed by human hands.

Second, let us see what changes in the schedule are proposed and at the same time look at the reasons why they are proposed.

The bill increases every pay rate in the schedule by 7½ percent. That action gives an employee at the bottom of the pay schedule an increase of \$215 a year. It gives the employees at the top, that is, level 19, an increase of \$1,000 a year. Worded another way, the employee at the entrance rate of level 19 today receives \$11,120 more per annum than the employee at the entrance rate of level 1. After an across-the-board increase of 7½ percent, the spread between these two employees would be expanded to \$11,905. In other words the difference between the two would be increased by \$785.

Besides the 7½ percent across-the-board increase, the amendment would add \$240 in the lower 5 pay levels, \$160 in level 6, and \$80 in level 7. How would that affect the relationship between rates. As indicated earlier, the present difference between the salary of the employee at the entrance rate of level 19 and the employee at the entrance rate of level 1 is \$11,120. After the 7½ percent in-

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2719

crease across-the-board and the addition of the \$240 cost-of-living adjustment, the spread would be \$11,665 or \$545 greater than it now is. So, let not Senators be deceived by talk that the pay schedule will be distorted or that the action will further compress the schedule or that the adjustment is unfair to employees in the higher pay brackets. Charges of that kind are simply not so.

What is the justification for the cost-of-living adjustment in the lower pay levels and not in the higher levels of the postal schedule? Why was it done only in the postal schedule and not in the general schedule of the Classification Act?

The explanation is very simple. The committee discovered a special situation literally crying for special attention. When the family dentist discovers that a pain in a patient's jaw stems from a cavity in one tooth, he promptly fills it. He does not cap every tooth in his mouth. That is exactly what the committee discovered and exactly what the amendment does. It fills a cavity in our Federal pay structure.

Let me explain briefly the nature and extent of the cavity and how it developed.

The pay of approximately 1 million of our Federal employees is fixed under the Classification Act. The typical employee under that act is described as one who enters the service when he is single, and at a young age, at grade GS-2 or GS-3. By the time he becomes engaged, he has moved up a grade. When he gets married, he has advanced another grade. With the birth of his first child, he has advanced still another grade. When the child is ready for school, he is in yet a higher grade. And so it goes, throughout his full career. He climbs the pay ladder, step by step, in consonance with increased expenses and family obligations.

A similar situation does not prevail in the postal service. The typical employee who enters the service as a clerk or letter carrier at a young age, retires some 30 or 35 years later still as a clerk or carrier.

I wish to emphasize that point very strongly to the Senate. The postal structure is not susceptible of the same type of analysis as the classified structure generally.

I repeat that the typical employee who enters the postal service as a clerk or letter carrier at a young age, retires some 30 or 35 years later, and very probably still is a letter carrier or a mail clerk when he retires. That is not because he has less ability or less initiative than does the employee who is subject to the Classification Act. No, indeed, it is not. It is because in the postal service the opportunity for advancement does not exist to the same degree as it does elsewhere in the Government.

Again I wish to stress the fact that the postal service has a high type of personnel, composed of dedicated men and women of high ability and faithfulness.

To bring the point home a bit more forcefully, I should like to call attention to the fact that of the 519,000 postal employees, more than 420,000 are paid at

level 4 rates or below. The top rate of level 4 is \$4,410. In other words, we are operating a \$3 billion a year business with employees, 4 out of 5 of whom receive less than \$4,500 a year.

Who are these employees? They are the carriers who trudge daily to our doorsteps or places of business. They are the men who work from dark to dawn, sorting our mail, so it will be ready for delivery as each carrier starts his early morning rounds at an hour before most of us are out of bed. They are the rural carriers who help unite and bring closer together the farms of our Nation. They are our neighbors. They are members of our communities. Their children run and play and go to school with our children.

Thus, the committee was confronted with a plain question of human values and a problem that strikes at the very heart of our postal system.

The solution lies in paying these employees—at least during periods of excessive inflation—a family wage, rather than a job wage. To argue otherwise would be to contend that these positions which, traditionally, have been filled by responsible heads of families in every city, town, and hamlet of the Nation, are no longer suitable for that purpose. The effect of following a course that could not but lead to that result would be reflected in the integrity, quality, and eventual cost of our postal service. That, in my opinion, would be much too high a price to pay for false and unwise economy.

The third point to which I wish to speak is "Why January 1 has been made the effective date?"

The Subcommittee on Federal Employees Compensation, of which I have the honor to be chairman, acted favorably on the pay bill on July 11, 1957. The full committee, under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], reported the bills on July 22, 1957. On August 27, 1957, this body, by an overwhelming vote of 69 to 17, approved a House bill in lieu of S. 27, and sent the House bill to the President.

If we were right at that time in believing that a pay increase was then justified, we would be wrong now if we ignored completely the inequity which has been endured by these loyal employees during some of the time that has elapsed.

I wish to stress the point that the cost of living has risen substantially for these people and their families since the President vetoed the bill last summer. All of us know that, and the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics bear it out very conclusively.

I should like to make one more point, and then I shall conclude: This year the President has recognized the need for a pay increase. I think in this instance, as in many other instances, he is much behind the times. I think the need for an increase should have been apparent to him last year, as it was to the majority of the Members of both branches of Congress. Be that as it may, the cost of the bill recommended by the administration is estimated at \$165 million. The

annual cost of the amendment will be \$188 million for the permanent increases, and \$121 million for the temporary cost-of-living adjustments. Together, these amount to \$309 million annually, or \$144 million in excess of what the President recommended. The difference amounts to \$5 a week per employee. The difference is a small amount indeed—perhaps too small.

Mr. President, I suggest that the adoption of this amendment is long overdue. It is a good amendment. It is fair. It is needed. It will do much to raise the morale of our postal employees. It will not cost money in the long run. It will save money. I am confident that the employees will respond with their usual diligence and devotion to duty to such a degree that their increased productivity and efficiency will go far towards offsetting the immediate increase in payroll figures.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield for a question to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Was it not developed, in the course of the testimony, that the wives of a great many of the letter carriers have to take jobs, too, in order to make a living for their families?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Not only that, but the men themselves have to engage in so-called "moonlighting," which means that after they end a long, hard day of work at their post-office jobs, a long day of pounding the pavement, while carrying a 35-pound mail sack, they have to drive a taxicab or pump gasoline at night, in order to be able to take care of the financial needs of their families. The Senator from North Dakota is quite correct in his suggestion.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not also true that the cost of living has steadily risen, so that it is most imperative that the retroactive feature be included?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Again the Senator from North Dakota is correct. Our subcommittee received testimony—as I know the able chairman of the full committee will agree—that many of these families are actually in dire financial straits and distress, bordering on poverty. We received testimony that many of them cannot pay even small medical bills of \$5, \$6, \$7, or \$8 a month, and are unable to buy proper, nutritious food for their children or to buy the clothing they need. All of us are aware of what has happened.

When we see the mail clerks paid \$4,000 or \$4,400 a year, and when we realize that virtually all of them are the heads of families, we know that the existing salaries are inadequate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a further question?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the testimony showed that sometimes when

the heads of such families buy milk, all the milk they can afford to buy has to be consumed by the children; the parents cannot afford to drink any of it?

Mr. NEUBERGER. We received all sorts of testimony bearing out what the Senator from North Dakota has stated.

Mr. LANGER. Did not the testimony also show that a similar situation often existed in the case of meat? I remember that the committee received testimony showing that the situation in the case of milk was similar to that in the case of meat, and that many of the families of the postal workers have been trying to live on hamburger sandwiches.

Mr. NEUBERGER. And some of them cannot even afford to buy hamburger.

Mr. LANGER. Yes. Furthermore, if they are able to buy hamburger, what they buy is not good; it is entirely different from the good meat available in North Dakota. We understand that many of these families are so short of funds that the hamburger they buy, when they can afford to, practically dissolves between their teeth. Such food is far different from the meat available to the people of North Dakota, who, when they wish to make a meat sandwich, are able to obtain good, wholesome meat for that purpose.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota is a member of the committee, and he heard all the testimony in favor of the making of the pay increase here proposed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, does not the distinguished Senator from Oregon believe that the effective date should be the date when the other bill was vetoed by the President?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Perhaps, in equity and fairness, it should be the date when the President vetoed the other bill. However, I am anxious to have the Senate pass the best possible bill which can be passed for the benefit of the postal employees. Delay will mean further hardship for them. Therefore, it seemed to me best to join the distinguished chairman of the committee in the compromise which was suggested; namely, to have January 1 established as the effective date.

In other words, it seemed to me preferable that we agree on a compromise which would have an opportunity of early enactment. In that connection, I emphasize the word "early."

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Oregon agree with me that the annual cost would be less than the amount of money our country has given to Yugoslavia and other Communist countries?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I do not think there is a direct relationship between this measure and foreign aid. I believe we should live up to both our foreign-aid responsibility and our responsibilities to the postal workers.

Mr. LANGER. That is true. However, is it not a fact that the amount proposed for the benefit of the postal workers would be less than the amount the Congress has voted to have sent by the United States to such foreign countries?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am not prepared to comment on that point. My concern

is to have the fairest possible amount provided for postal employees.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me? Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. McNAMARA. I desire to congratulate the Senator from Oregon. I realize his keen interest in the postal pay bill.

Does not he reluctantly go along with the idea of tying the postal pay increase to the postal rate bill?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes, I have considerable reluctance about that. I have felt in my heart and soul that they were separate issues.

I felt they were separate for one basic reason. I do not want to risk establishing a precedent that we are going to grant a wage increase to all our postal employees only when we increase postal rates. That would be especially perilous because, for example, first-class mail rates have not been increased for 26 years. First-class mail rates comprise the vast bulk of the income of the Post Office Department. During the 26 years that have elapsed, the cost of living has repeatedly soared, and dire personal financial needs have affected all postal employees and their families.

For these reasons, I have some doubt and trepidation in establishing a precedent which might haunt us and the postal employees and all concerned.

Mr. McNAMARA. It is my greatest fear that, from the long-range standpoint, we shall be doing violence to the employees of the Post Office Department by following this procedure. I hope the RECORD will spell out that that is not the intent of the committee, and it is not the recommendation of the committee that any such interpretation should be placed on our action.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let us be candid about the situation we face. All of us know that the President of the United States, the present occupant of the White House, has certainly been indifferent to a postal pay increase. I think he has vetoed several bills looking toward such a goal in recent years. Many of us who are as fervently interested in the welfare of postal employees, as are the Senator from Michigan and I, have felt that a pay raise would be more acceptable if it were attached to the postal rate bill. Those of us who have taken that position have done so conscientiously and sincerely.

I have felt that if we sent to the White House simultaneously, or almost simultaneously, an adequate rate-increase bill, the President of the United States, even though he was not of our party, would certainly search his own soul and heart very, very painstakingly before he would veto a bill to grant more equitable treatment to the postal employees. That has been my own position.

Mr. McNAMARA. I have noticed from a reading of the newspapers this week that, because of the increase in the cost of living, employees who have a cost-of-living section in negotiated contracts with their employers, have been granted a 3-cent-an-hour increase. My understanding is that is the tenth such allowance received by them in the past 12 months.

Our postal employees are so far behind, in comparison with any other workers, that I do not know how anyone can be worried about a bill being vetoed. At least, anybody who knows what is going on at all would certainly have to go along with much more of an increase than is being proposed at this time.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Michigan has certainly brought out a very cogent point. To me this proposal is the absolute minimum which the postal employees should receive. The Senator from Michigan has pointed out to us—and he always makes very valuable suggestions in debate—the substantial increases repeatedly received by the wage-board employee of the Government. One can wonder what inducement there is for an ambitious and intellectual person to go into the postal service when he can be a wage-board employee, working at carpentry or some other trade, and receive proper wage increases, without having to wait out a long, slow, laborious, tedious legislative process.

Mr. McNAMARA. I conclude by saying that I am opposed to tying the two together. I shall vote for the bill reluctantly, because it might set a very bad precedent.

Mr. LANGER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. PROXMIER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota. Then I shall yield to the Senator from South Carolina and to the Senator from Wisconsin, in sequence.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I think the increase is deplorably low. I wish to comment on the question of the precedent which might be set. The Monroney-La Follette bill provided that there would never be another special committee created. Yet during all the years since the Monroney-La Follette bill was enacted, the Senate has time and again avoided that precedent and that law and has created special committees, as the Senator from Oregon very well knows. I do not think we shall be establishing any precedent at all today by tying the two bills together. The bill certainly will go a long way toward avoiding a veto, in my opinion.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I believe the Senator from Oregon will agree with me that no member of the committee said he was in favor of tying the two propositions together because he thought the Federal employees of the Post Office Department should not get an increase if a rate bill was not passed. Is that not also a fact?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is exactly correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We did not want this action to be taken as a precedent that there must be an increase in postal rates before Federal employees in the Post Office Department can get a raise in the future. We want that clearly understood. Is that not true?

Mr. NEUBERGER. It not only is true, but I think it is extremely essential that we build the legislative history here on the floor of the Senate today, so that when the matter comes up in the future, as undoubtedly it will, it will be explicitly understood that the Members of the Senate who took this position did not regard any coupling together of these bills as a precedent which had to be followed on similar future occasions.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that the matter is being handled in this way in order to expedite action? A bill to increase postal rates has passed the House and is now in process of passing the Senate. Also, last year a bill providing increased pay for postal workers was passed. The appropriate committee of the House had hearings on the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The House bill was sent to the Senate last year. We used the House bill last year. Now we are coupling the two measures in the bill presently before the Senate in order to expedite matters, both respecting postal rates and pay and classified pay.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So it cannot be said that hearings have not been held in the House of Representatives, that it has not passed upon the facts, or that a similar bill has not been reported in the House.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The House has had ample hearings and ample debate and full discussion. I thank the chairman of the committee for his helpful comments on this issue.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as a member of the compensation subcommittee, along with the Senator from Oregon—

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Wisconsin is a very valued member.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to congratulate the Senator from Oregon as a real champion of postal workers. I do not mean a champion only in Oregon, but a champion in Wisconsin, and all over the country. I think he has done an extremely good job under the circumstances.

I should like to emphasize one point. I have found in traveling through the State of Wisconsin, and in the last 5 years I have been in every county at least 12 times, in every village and city throughout the State it is the rule—not the exception, but the rule—for postal workers to have two jobs, or that their wives work, even though they have small children. Such a situation is not exceptional, but is usual among postal employees in the first 4 or 5 classes, the ones most affected by the increase in the cost of living. They are required to have two jobs or have their wives work.

I earnestly hope the \$240 proposal of the Senator from Oregon will prevail.

Finally, I should like to say that I, too, greatly deplore the necessity, if it is a

necessity, for tying in the postal pay bill, which I enthusiastically support and which is so urgently needed, with the increase in the letter rate to 5 cents rather than an increase to 4 cents.

I know some of my distinguished colleagues may not have that conflict, but I have it, and I hope they will believe me when I state it is going to be an extremely difficult vote for me to cast, because I feel very deep sympathy for the postal employees, but I think it is a great mistake to increase the rate for first-class mail to 5 cents.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the able Senator from Wisconsin, who is one of the most outstanding and helpful members of the Federal Compensation Subcommittee, which reported the pay bill. The conditions the Senator has observed in Wisconsin parallel those I have found to exist in my State of Oregon.

In the testimony which was presented before our committee, it was stated that from 60 to 70 percent of the postal employees in the lower grades have other jobs, and about 40 percent of the families are in such situations that the wives additionally have to work. We sometimes wonder what this condition does to family life and what contribution it makes toward juvenile delinquency and the other conditions which all of us deplore so much.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield to the able Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin as to the very able presentation made by the junior Senator from Oregon. The conditions which have been explained and outlined by both able Senators are identical with the conditions as they exist in Colorado. I know how difficult it will be for some of us to vote for the bill under the existing circumstances, but I feel we must consider the dire need, the desperate need, of the working people of the Post Office Department. We will have to march, I should say, in the face of our real misgivings about the bill as it will be passed, in my opinion, and the postal rate which will be imposed upon those who really should not pay as much as will be imposed upon them.

I desire to add one further comment. The excellent and superb work done by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, not only in this debate, but through the months and through the years, fighting for these people, is appreciated not only in Oregon and in Wisconsin but also in Colorado. I know the postal workers of Colorado join with me in commending the able junior Senator from Oregon for what he has done and will do in their behalf.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Colorado for his very great, though slightly exaggerated, kindness to me.

Mr. LAUSCHE and Mr. SPARKMAN addressed the chair.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], and then I shall yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. It is impossible for the Senator to be heard.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator tell me what the percentage of the pay increase will be in the event the recommended bill is passed? I understand the President recommends a 6 percent pay increase, which would cost \$165 million. The measure which has been recommended by the committee with the 7½-percent pay increase would cost \$188 million, and an additional \$121 million to reflect the cost of living increase, or a total of \$309 million. My question is, what will be the percentage of the pay increase if the recommended proposal is adopted?

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is my understanding that it is an average across-the-board increase of approximately 12 percent. The explanation is that most of the postal employees are in the lower five grades.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The President recommended a 6-percent pay increase. Can the Senator tell me what the percentage of increase would be if the provisions of the House bill of last year were to be adopted?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe the House bill of last year provided approximately 11 percent, if I am not mistaken. It was an across-the-board increase of something like \$545. I am trying to compute that in percentages in my mind, without papers. I think the increase was around 11 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To summarize, then, the President has recommended a 6-percent pay increase, which would cost \$165 million; and the committee, in effect, has recommended an approximately 12-percent pay increase.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Approximately 12 percent is provided in the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The 12-percent pay increase would cost \$309 million. The bill as passed by the House last year involved an increase per employee of \$545?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Five hundred and forty-five dollars across the board.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That provided approximately an 11-percent increase?

Mr. NEUBERGER. About 11 percent. I cannot vouch precisely for that figure, but I believe it was approximately 11 percent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I desire to ask two brief questions of the Senator.

In conference, so far as the postal employees' salaries are concerned, under the bill as it will be considered, the matter will be in conference from zero up to approximately 12 percent, since there is no House bill?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is correct. There is no House bill which has been passed as to this particular issue, because the House bill which we accepted last year was subsequently vetoed by the President of the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The same thing will be true with respect to the classified employees, provided such provisions are added to the bill presently under consideration?

Mr. NEUBERGER. If we adopt the classified pay bill, S. 734, I presume the same situation will be true. I cannot say whether the provisions of that bill will be added to the postal rate-pay package or not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. So far as the postal rate bill is concerned, the bill before the Senate is a House bill, so there will be a wide-open conference on all rates between the rates passed by the House and the rates passed by the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. There will be a wide-open conference between the Senate and the House. The Senator from Alabama is correct in that statement. There are considerable differences, as the Senator knows, in the various classifications and rates in the postal rate bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the able Senator from Oregon for the tremendous job he has done in managing the bill on the floor and through the committee.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As always, the Senator from Alabama is very kind.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield the floor?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is recognized.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer as a substitute for the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment to the amendment read, or does he desire to have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be printed in the RECORD. I wish to discuss the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kansas?

There being no objection, Mr. CARLSON's amendment to the amendment of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new title:

"TITLE IV. INCREASES IN COMPENSATION OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES"

"SEC. 401. The act entitled 'Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955,' approved June 10, 1955 (Public Law 68, 84th Cong.), is hereby amended as follows:

"(a) In section 301 (a) strike out the postal field service schedule, and insert the following schedule:

"Postal field service schedule"

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.....	\$3,128	\$3,236	\$3,344	\$3,452	\$3,560	\$3,668	\$3,776
2.....	3,352	3,466	3,580	3,694	3,808	3,922	4,036
3.....	3,612	3,737	3,862	3,987	4,112	4,237	4,362
4.....	3,969	4,105	4,241	4,377	4,513	4,649	4,785
5.....	4,210	4,346	4,482	4,618	4,754	4,890	5,026
6.....	4,546	4,688	4,850	5,002	5,154	5,306	5,458
7.....	4,917	5,085	5,253	5,421	5,589	5,757	5,925
8.....	5,308	5,492	5,676	5,860	6,044	6,228	6,412
9.....	5,733	5,933	6,133	6,333	6,533	6,733	6,933
10.....	6,293	6,510	6,727	6,944	7,161	7,378	7,595
11.....	6,921	7,160	7,399	7,638	7,877	8,116	8,355
12.....	7,619	7,879	8,139	8,399	8,659	8,919	9,179
13.....	8,388	8,670	8,952	9,234	9,516	9,798	10,080
14.....	9,221	9,525	9,829	10,133	10,437	10,741	11,045
15.....	10,142	10,468	10,794	11,120	11,446	11,772	12,098
16.....	11,174	11,500	11,826	12,152	12,478	12,804	13,130
17.....	12,366	12,692	13,018	13,344	13,670	13,996	14,322
18.....	13,885	14,211	14,537	14,863	15,189	15,515	15,841
19.....	15,188	15,514	15,840	16,166	16,492		
20.....	17,360						

"(b) In section 302 (a) strike out the rural-carrier schedule, and insert the following schedule:

"Rural carrier schedule"

	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum.....	\$1,700.00	\$1,749.00	\$1,798.00	\$1,847.00	\$1,896.00	\$1,945.00	\$1,994.00
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route.....	70.65	72.80	74.95	77.10	79.25	81.40	83.55
For each mile of route over 30 miles.....	23.87	23.87	23.87	23.87	23.87	23.87	23.87
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum.....	1,700.00						
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route.....	70.65						
For each mile of route over 30 miles.....	23.87						
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

"Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier."

"(c) In section 302 (c) strike out '\$4,700' fourth-class office schedule and insert the following schedule:

"(d) In section 303 (a) strike out the

"Fourth-class office schedule"

Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
\$1,300 to \$1,499.99.....	\$2,729	\$2,820	\$2,911	\$3,002	\$3,093	\$3,184	\$3,275
\$500 to \$1,299.99.....	2,503	2,586	2,669	2,752	2,835	2,918	3,001
\$400 to \$499.99.....	2,048	2,116	2,184	2,252	2,320	2,388	2,456
\$350 to \$399.99.....	1,593	1,646	1,699	1,752	1,805	1,858	1,911
\$250 to \$349.99.....	1,137	1,175	1,213	1,251	1,289	1,327	1,365
\$200 to \$249.99.....	912	942	972	1,002	1,032	1,062	1,092
\$100 to \$199.99.....	681	704	727	750	773	796	819
Under \$100.....	456	471	486	501	516	531	546

"SEC. 402. (a) The annual rate of basic salary of any officer or employee whose basic salary by reason of the provisions of section 504 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 is at a rate between two scheduled rates, or above the highest scheduled rate, in the postal field service schedule, the rural carrier schedule, or the fourth-class office schedule, whichever may be applicable, is hereby increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this title in the next lower rate in such schedule."

"(b) As used in this section, the term 'basic salary' has the same meaning as when used in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.

"SEC. 403. No increase under the provisions of this title shall be construed to be an equivalent increase within the meaning of section 401 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act.

"SEC. 404. The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized and directed to grant, effective as of October 1, 1957, increases in the compensation of postal employees of the Canal

Zone Government comparable to those provided by this title for similar employees.

"Sec. 405. This act shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

"Sec. 406. (a) This title shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CARLSON. I shall be happy to yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gore	Monroney
Allott	Green	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Morton
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Beall	Hill	Murray
Bennett	Hoblitzell	Neuberger
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Payne
Bridges	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Jackson	Proxmire
Butler	Javits	Purtell
Carlson	Jenner	Revercomb
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Church	Kennedy	Smathers
Clark	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lausche	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Ellender	Malone	Wiley
Ervin	Mansfield	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Yarborough
Frear	McClellan	Young
Goldwater	McNamara	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I regret that I am unable to support the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I regret it first because I am in favor of a pay increase to our deserving and dedicated postal employees.

Second, I regret it because I must disagree with the recommendations of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making an announcement?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, Mr. President, I desire to ask for the yeas and nays on the Carlson amendment, so that all Senators may know that we are to have a yeas-and-nays vote on the substitute.

Mr. CARLSON. I am very happy to join in that request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Carlson amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want all Senators to know that at the conclusion of the address of the Senator from Kansas, or at the conclusion of the addresses of other Senators who may wish to speak

on this amendment, there will be a vote on the Carlson amendment. The Senate will remain in session this evening to complete action upon the pending bill and the classified-pay bill. If we are unable to do so, there will be a session tomorrow for that purpose.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held extended hearings on various committee proposals, and spent much time and labor in preparing a bill. Members of the committee were sincere. They held deep convictions on the question. When our committee reported the bill, I stated that I would vote to report it, with the understanding that I would offer some amendments when it was considered on the floor of the Senate. Evidently, my views were shared by other Senators, because the bill was reported unanimously.

The pending bill contains some provisions which, I believe, if adopted by the Congress, would prevent it from becoming law.

If that should happen, then our postal employees would not receive pay increases that are fair and justified and needed. President Eisenhower, in his budget message to Congress, recommended pay increases for postal workers, for classified workers, and for military personnel. They total \$1,052 million, which is a substantial sum of money. I should like to discuss the amendment I have offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

My substitute amendment would give all postal employees a flat—and I wish to emphasize that—a flat 8½ percent increase in salary, instead of the 7½-percent increase recommended by the committee, and it would eliminate the unfair and unrealistic "temporary cost-of-living" increases of up to \$240 in the first 7 pay levels of the postal field schedules and in all pay levels of the rural carrier and fourth-class office schedules. It would also eliminate the retroactive features included in the committee amendment.

There are several obvious advantages to the substitute I am proposing which should recommend themselves immediately to the Members of this body.

In the first place, a flat 8½-percent increase will give postal employees a badly needed raise in their salaries now—and I want to emphasize the word "now"—and not merely dangle a possible increase before their hungry eyes, which may or may not be granted to them at some future date.

Second, Mr. President, if I may express a purely personal opinion, I feel confident that an 8½-percent increase, without the added impediments proposed in the committee amendment, can get approval from the House conferees and from the President.

Time after time the President has demonstrated that he will not sign any bill which would disrupt the principles and the differentials embodied in Public Law 68. The so-called temporary cost-of-living increases not only would destroy the differentials established in Public Law 68, but they would be highly

discriminatory against postal supervisors and postmasters in the field.

They would also be unfair to employees who receive them in that they would be summarily withdrawn from them after 3 years—and who of us can say that in 3 years time the cost of living, which these temporary increases are supposed to meet, will not be even higher than it is today?

Mr. President, judging from past experience I am absolutely confident that if those temporary cost-of-living increases are allowed to remain in the bill, they will be the direct cause of a presidential veto.

I am certain we all share the feeling of urgency to give the postal workers an increase in salary now. It would be, in my opinion, foolish, and inhuman if we were to enact legislation which could not get Presidential approval and which would cause an interminable delay in achieving a pay increase for the 500,000 dedicated human beings who make up our postal employee force.

Having had some experience with conferences I wish to mention the fact that if the committee amendment is adopted, and the bill goes to conference—which it will do—we will be very weak on the bill, to say the least, if it contains too many controversial features—and there are enough in the bill already—and that we will be months in reaching agreement on the postal rate-postal pay bill, if it embodies too many such features in it. I am trying to work out a proposal that can be considered in conference, with the assurance that we will get a bill out of conference.

My proposal would cost approximately \$221 million a year, as contrasted with the \$320 million cost of the committee proposed.

My substitute amendment would give regular postal clerks and letter carriers an immediate average wage increase of 18 cents an hour and would bring their average hourly salary up to \$2.29 and the maximum rate, including longevity up to \$2.44 an hour.

But, best of all, Mr. President, my substitute proposal would insure the postal employees of that increase now. The \$221 million provided for by my proposal would start pouring into the pockets of our postal employees immediately. There is, in my opinion, no possibility that it would suffer the agonizing delays which would surely be the fate of any postal pay legislation containing objectionable flat cost-of-living increases for some employees, and not for others, or any legislation containing retroactive features which would cost as much as 26 million for every month included.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to finish my statement first. However, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. What would be the effective date of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CARLSON. I was about to discuss the retroactive features of the bill. My amendment proposes that the increases shall become effective on the first pay period after its enactment into law. I

should like to take a few minutes now to say why the retroactive feature would prove objectionable.

It would impose an intolerable administrative burden on the Post Office Department. I notice that the chairman has amended his proposal which was submitted originally and which carried an October date, and now carries a January 1 date.

Therefore, my figures are not quite accurate on that basis. However, I wish to state some figures and some of the problems which would arise if we enact retroactive legislation. Let us think of all the people on the payroll. Let us think of the people who were on the payroll last October 1 and who were on the payroll on January 1. Let us think of all the people who have retired or died or gone into the military service, or have left for any other reason. Those people would be entitled to retroactive pay. I should like to give some figures as to how many that might be.

The number of employees subject to the provisions of the bill who have died during that period is estimated at 1,900. That is from October 1 to February 1. Furthermore, the States are involved. The total in the categories of retirements in the postal service and deaths is 9,400. I assume that if we are going to do this for the postal service, we will do it also for the classified service. We must give some consideration to that fact.

It is estimated, based upon the same period of time that was used for the postal employees, October 1, 1957, to February 1, 1958, the total number of retirements and deaths in the classified field has been 4,000. Broken down the figure is 3,200 for retirements, and 800 deaths.

I mention that because it is one of the problems which must be considered. I am told that administratively the cost would be a million dollars.

There is no budget provision for the \$26 million a month cost of retroactive payments. This would necessitate huge supplemental appropriations.

In the postal establishment there are at least 100,000 employees on irregular tours of duty. The administrative cost in recomputing the pay of every employee would be intolerably complicated by this factor and would come to at least an additional and unnecessary million dollars a year.

Let us bear in mind the fact that if a man was in grade 5 in October and in grade 7 in January, he would be entitled to retroactive pay. Furthermore, there will be some changes within grades also. That will take a great deal of administrative work. The administrative cost would be complicated by this factor, and would amount at least, as I said earlier, to a million dollars a year, and the problems and complications involved would be tremendous.

Think for a moment of all the thousands of employees who leave the Department, or Government service itself, each month. Think of the thousands upon thousands of employees who transfer to other agencies of Government.

Payment of these employees would be extremely complex. Thousands of

claims would have to be adjudicated in the departments and in the General Accounting Office if this bill were to be made retroactive.

And it would all be so unnecessary.

Mr. President, I say we should forget about these complicating factors.

Let us give the postal employees a salary increase now. Let us give it to them in the simplest, fairest, most direct way—in the form of a straight 8½ percent increase for everyone.

I should like to remind my colleagues that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for the other body has already approved a straight percentage increase, without retroactive features, for all postal employees. If we approve a straight percentage increase, such as I am proposing, we shall be establishing a basis for negotiation with the conferees and we shall be avoiding unnecessary and time-consuming complications which could only result in postponing even further the badly needed pay increase which every postal employee should get as soon as possible.

Mr. President, in proposing a straight 8½-percent increase for every employee, I am being practical. This is no time for a visionary contemplation of what might be possible at some future date, nor is this the time for partisan political consideration.

The postal employees need the money. They need it now.

If we approve the 8½-percent increase which I propose, I feel certain we can give the postal employees the money they need and should have as quickly as our accelerated parliamentary procedures will allow.

This is the simple way, the practical way, the fair way.

It is the way, Mr. President, which we should take.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to reply, with extreme brevity, to the Senator from Kansas. I know he has submitted this alternative with his usual high purposes and good motives.

To begin with, the administrative difficulties which he has mentioned are valid. Still, only yesterday and the day before he himself took the position that the administrative difficulties involved in separate rates for local mail and out of town mail were not a valid point. I supported him in his position. But certainly the point of administrative difficulties was raised, and the Senator from Kansas took a somewhat different position then.

Mr. CARLSON. I admitted it, however.

Mr. NEUBERGER. There are always administrative difficulties when we are dealing with six, seven, or eight hundred thousand able, faithful Federal employees. The real difficulty in the proposal offered by the Senator from Kansas is that it does not go to the heart of the extraordinary problem involved in the postal service, the problem of the vast bulk of postal employees, virtually every one of them a man with a family. They are rooted during their entire

working careers in grades up to the fifth level—in other words, in the lower grades.

Let me show the Senator what the difference between his proposal and the proposal of the Senate committee would mean to a letter carrier getting about \$4,000 a year—and there are hundreds of thousands of them. An increase of 8½ percent would mean \$340 a year. But the proposal of the committee, 7½ percent plus the \$240 cost-of-living bonus would mean \$540 a year. That is a difference of \$200 a year to a man in the low-income levels in the postal service, who today is having to work part time outside his regular work in order to support his family.

When we add to the \$200 difference the retroactivity difference between the proposal of the Senator from Kansas and that in the bill before the committee, the amount becomes quite substantial.

The Senator from Kansas has made an alternative proposal in good faith, but I regret to say that it does not go to the heart of the matter, namely, the problem of the letter carriers and the mail clerks who constitute the bulk of the postal workers, and whose income is in the lower levels.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Oregon conducted the hearings on the proposed legislation which is before the Senate today. He did outstanding work in the holding of the hearings. I read some of the testimony, and I heard some of it myself. As I have said before, he is entitled to much credit for bringing the bill before the Senate.

I stated that I would vote to report it, but that I did not favor some of the items in the bill. I have today kept my word by submitting amendments to the bill which would secure its approval.

I want to get a pay increase for the postal employees. I have been around the Capitol for many years, on one side or the other. The chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and I know something about conferences. We shall be going into a conference with a pay bill attached to a rate bill. The chairman may remember that in 1951 we went to the House with a 4-cent postage bill. A postage bill was passed in 1951. We fought for the Senate's position. Had it been approved, the Post Office Department would not be in the position of having a \$2-billion deficit which has been growing since 1951.

Now we shall be going into conference with a 5-cent postage bill. I can visualize that some problems will arise. We are going into conference with proposed pay legislation. The bill will be controversial, to say the least. When we consider the action taken by the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it does not seem to me that we shall find an adjustment easy.

I dislike to do so, but I predict that we will be in conference for weeks, possibly months. If it takes months, and the bill comes back to the Senate the last of June or July, I doubt very much that we shall have either rate or pay legislation this year. I am sincere in what I say.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have listened with much attention to the very clear and earnest presentation made by the Senator from Kansas. I know how sincere he is in his proposal. The Senator well knows, as do my colleagues, that I have strongly favored an increase in pay for the postal workers. I supported the bill when it was before the Senate previously and was passed by Congress. I support it again.

Do I correctly understand that in the proposed amendment of the Senator from Kansas the increase in pay is 8½ percent instead of 7½ percent?

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But also that there will be eliminated, if the amendment shall be adopted, the payment of \$240 under the cost-of-living provision. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Also, do I correctly understand that the raise would go into effect as of the date of the passage of the bill, instead of January 1, 1958, as S. 27, or the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, now provides?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think that clearly presents the situation and sums it up, certainly to my mind.

Has the able Senator given thought to, or would he consider now or at a later time in the course of the discussion, restoring to his own amendment that part of S. 27 which would make the increase of 8½ percent to begin as of January 1, 1958? Therein, it appears to me, is a compromise which may well be considered by the Senate. We might well take, first, the 8½ percent, which is 1 percent more in pay, and then add to it the provision that the bill shall become effective from the first day of January, 1958.

I do not call upon the Senator to answer that question now; I simply ask and propose that he give consideration to it in offering his amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the suggestion made by the Senator from West Virginia. The January 1, 1958, date has much merit; but again I am afraid the conditions will be such that the bill will not pass for months. I do not want to put so much retroactivity into a bill that we know it cannot be approved.

There are two things which must be kept in mind. First, the President recommended a 6-percent increase. I have never discussed my proposal with the White House or anyone else. The 8½ percent proposal is my own. I doubt very much that the committee will take 8½ percent, but I am willing to start the battle for it.

Second, the President, in his budget message to Congress, asked that the postal pay increase be made effective July 1. If the retroactivity is to be made effective as of January 1, 1958, and the bill is not passed until some time later, I have concern about its being approved.

But I will give consideration to the proposal; and if my amendment is adopted, we will go into that later.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Kansas made a comment about the pay increase as related to the action of the House. Would he mind repeating that statement?

Mr. CARLSON. I believe the House committee—not the House itself—has already approved an across-the-board increase, with no retroactivity. If the Senate bill with retroactivity is passed, the entire matter will be in conference.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the percentage of increase?

Mr. CARLSON. I was in error about the retroactivity. The House bill goes back to August 25, 1957.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was the percentage of increase?

Mr. CARLSON. Eight percent.

I desire to make a correction, because I want my statement to be right. The House bill provides for from 12 to 15 percent, as I understand.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the 12 to 15 percent eventually apply to the 2,500,000 employees in the civil service, or is it likely to apply to them?

Mr. CARLSON. While we are on that point, I may say that we are dealing now only with the postal employees—500,000 of them.

But there are 1,500,000 other Government employees who, so far as I am concerned, will be treated in the same way. I do not like the idea of setting one salary schedule for one class of employees and another schedule for another class of employees. I simply cannot do that.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I shall take only 2 minutes.

The argument of my distinguished and beloved friend, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], that the Senate dare not legislate that which today is in its heart and in its mind, leaves me unmoved.

The Senate is supposed to be a legislative body. The threat of a veto by the White House, by way of Postmaster General Summerfield, does not move me; and I do not believe it moves any other Member of the Senate.

Our duty is to do what is necessary—to pass the bill and send it to the White House; and then, if the President cares to veto it, and does veto it, to override the veto by a two-thirds vote.

Senators are not sent to this body to be puppets of the Postmaster General.

Second, with the cost of living at an all-time high, we can do no less than move to make up for a part—it will be only a part—of the increase this administration has created.

Therefore, Mr. President, for the Senate to vote for less than the proposed 7½-percent increase for the 4 lowest grades, with a \$240 cost-of-living bonus, would be improper. The proposed increase will be only common justice.

Mr. President, if it is proper for the postal rates charged to the housewives to be increased 66⅔ percent—as the Senate has voted—then the Senate should vote for more than a 7½-percent pay increase for the men whose backs will bear the great volume of mail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The question is on agree-

ing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall support the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

No other Member of this body has given more attention than has he, over a long period of years, to the postal service. No Member has been more interested than has he in the efficiency of the Post Office Department and—of even greater importance—the interests of the postal employees.

The distinguished Senator from Kansas has submitted the amendment in complete good faith, not only in the belief that it provides for an equitable wage increase of 8½ percent, but also in the belief that the amendment has a fair chance of ultimately becoming law.

I believe that each Member of the Senate must, of course, in connection with every piece of proposed legislation, act on his own responsibility, as a part of the legislative arm of the Government of the United States. But Senators are not unmindful of the fact that, as Senators of the United States, they also have some responsibilities relative to the fiscal condition of the Government and the Post Office deficit. The Senate has been attempting to end that deficit, not in toto but in part, by means of making adjustments in the postal rates.

There is no question that a case has been made for making an increase in the wages of the postal workers, just as a case will be made for making an increase in the wages of the employees in the classified service and, ultimately, for an increase in the wages of those in the armed services as well. All these are important. However, the pattern we establish here is bound to have its repercussions on the subsequent legislative measures, both in the case of the wage rates which are set and also in the case of the impact on the Federal Treasury.

It seems to me that the proposal of the Senator from Kansas for an 8½-percent straight across-the-board increase in the pay of the postal workers not only will provide them with an equitable increase but also carries with it at least a fair assurance that it will become law.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the substitute amendment of the Senator from Kansas will be agreed to by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] as amended.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I submit to the Senator from Kansas the

idea of having the bill become effective on January 1, 1958.

Previously I stated I would not insist on such a provision. However, at this time I ask the Senator from Kansas whether he will agree to an amendment to his amendment, so as to have it provide that the bill will become effective on January 1, 1958, instead of on the date of passage. Is the Senator from Kansas willing to amend his amendment in that way?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I believe such an amendment would be in the third degree.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator from Kansas accept such a change at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Kansas cannot modify his amendment at this time, except by unanimous consent, in view of the fact that the yeas and nays have already been ordered on the question of agreeing to his amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is it in order for a Member of the Senate other than the Senator from Kansas to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Kansas is in the second degree; therefore, it is not subject to amendment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I make the definite statement that if my amendment is approved, I will, after its approval, make the date January 1.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kansas may modify his amendment in accordance with the suggestion which has been made by the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for unanimous consent that the Senator from Kansas may modify his amendment in accordance with the request which has been made by the Senator from West Virginia?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] is paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—29

Allott	Cooper	Lausche
Barrett	Dirksen	Martin, Pa.
Bennett	Dworshak	Morton
Bricker	Flanders	Mundt
Bridges	Goldwater	Revercomb
Bush	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler	Hoblitzeil	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Hruska	Watkins
Case, S. Dak.	Jenner	Williams
Clark	Knowland	

NAYS—54

Aliken	Humphrey	Murray
Anderson	Jackson	Neuberger
Beall	Javits	Pastore
Bible	Johnson, Tex.	Payne
Carroll	Johnson, S. C.	Potter
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Proxmire
Church	Kennedy	Purtell
Cotton	Kerr	Russell
Douglas	Kuchel	Scott
Eastland	Langer	Smathers
Ellender	Long	Smith, Maine
Ervin	Magnuson	Sparkman
Frear	Malone	Stennis
Gore	Mansfield	Thurmond
Green	McClellan	Thye
Hayden	McNamara	Wiley
Hill	Monroney	Yarborough
Holland	Morse	Young

NOT VOTING—13

Byrd	Hennings	Schoeppel
Capehart	Ives	Symington
Chavez	Martin, Iowa	Talmadge
Curtis	O'Mahoney	
Fulbright	Robertson	

So Mr. CARLSON's amendment, as modified, to the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina, as amended, was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the

vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Kansas to my amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from South Carolina to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, we did not hear the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk has previously read the amendment. After the amendment was offered, there was an amendment offered to the amendment by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. The amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON], the original amendment, has not been disposed of. The Chair is now asking what disposition the Senate wishes to make of the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, what is the amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The parliamentary situation is that we now revert to consideration of the original amendment, which was offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSON], and which attaches the provisions of the postal pay bill to the postal rate bill. Is that not the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As reported from the committee with a modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct in his understanding.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may I make a further parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the vote should be "no" on the amendment there would still be pending before the Senate the postal rate bill as separate from the postal pay amendment to the bill. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The postal rate bill as distinct from the postal pay amendment; that is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state his parliamentary inquiry.

1958.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2727

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have an amendment to S. 27 printed and lying on the desk. May I ask whether adoption of the postal pay amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina will cut off further amendment to the provisions of S. 27 which have been offered in the form of an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is attempting to straighten out the situation. The original amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina is the amendment which is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the clerk state that amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Chair hand the original amendment to the clerk and have the clerk read it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not have the original amendment, but the Chair will get it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] offered an amendment to the pending amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To the amendment which had been offered by the committee. Since that amendment was rejected, the Senate in its consideration will revert now to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the amendment which the Chair is now asking be stated.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Chair refers to the postal pay increase amendment, and not the classified pay increase proposal?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The postal pay raise bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the Chair will state that the amendment now pending before the Senate is the postal pay amendment, the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina. That amendment is now open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is an amendment which would raise the pay of Federal employees generally germane to an amendment which proposes only an increase in the pay of the field service of the Post Office Department?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will seek the advice of the Parliamentarian to give the Senator the correct answer.

Will the Senator from South Dakota state his parliamentary inquiry again, so that we can be clear on the parliamentary situation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, my understanding is that the amendment now pending, offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], is an amendment to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department only. My question is, Is it germane, under the unanimous-consent agreement, to offer an amendment to increase pay generally?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have no unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that there is no unanimous-consent agreement at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield I think I can clarify the situation.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] proposed an amendment, known as the postal pay amendment. It contained provisions of a bill which had been reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. To that amendment was offered a substitute by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. That substitute having been rejected, the question recurs on the original proposal of the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee; namely, the postal pay amendment. That is now the question for the Senate to act upon.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has an amendment, which is in order, and he desires to call up his amendment, so that the Senate can act on that.

The amendment which is before the Senate is the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] on postal pay; and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] desires to offer an amendment to that amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senate be in order? We can clarify the parliamentary situation very quickly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Some time ago I heard the distinguished majority leader propose a unanimous-consent agreement which embraced the requirement that amendments be germane. Apparently that agreement was not entered into.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, the agreement did not require that amendments be germane; second, it was not proposed, it was simply read; and third, it was never called up, because the Senator from Texas was informed it would be objected to if called up.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So we are not operating under an agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is not operating under a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The parliamentary situation is this: There is an amendment pending before the Senate, which has been offered by the Senator from South Carolina, as to the postal pay increase, which is title IV.

The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is now recognized for the purpose of offering an amendment to that amendment. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in lieu of the schedule appearing between lines 2 and 3 it is proposed to insert the following:

"Postal field service schedule"

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
1.....	\$3,095	\$3,205	\$3,315	\$3,425	\$3,535	\$3,645	\$3,755
Temporary rate.....	3,335	3,445	3,555	3,665	3,775	3,885	3,995
2.....	3,320	3,435	3,550	3,665	3,780	3,895	4,010
Temporary rate.....	3,560	3,675	3,790	3,905	4,020	4,135	4,250
3.....	3,580	3,705	3,830	3,955	4,080	4,205	4,330
Temporary rate.....	3,820	3,945	4,070	4,195	4,320	4,445	4,570
4.....	3,935	4,070	4,205	4,340	4,475	4,610	4,745
Temporary rate.....	4,175	4,310	4,445	4,580	4,715	4,850	4,985
5.....	4,175	4,305	4,440	4,575	4,710	4,845	4,980
Temporary rate.....	4,410	4,545	4,680	4,815	4,950	5,085	5,220
6.....	4,505	4,635	4,765	4,895	5,025	5,155	5,285
Temporary rate.....	4,745	4,885	5,025	5,165	5,305	5,445	5,585
7.....	4,870	5,035	5,200	5,365	5,530	5,695	5,860
Temporary rate.....	5,110	5,275	5,440	5,605	5,770	5,935	6,100
8.....	5,255	5,440	5,625	5,810	5,995	6,180	6,365
Temporary rate.....	5,495	5,680	5,865	6,050	6,235	6,420	6,605
9.....	5,675	5,875	6,075	6,275	6,475	6,675	6,875
Temporary rate.....	5,915	6,115	6,315	6,515	6,715	6,915	7,115
10.....	6,235	6,450	6,665	6,880	7,095	7,310	7,525
Temporary rate.....	6,475	6,690	6,905	7,120	7,335	7,550	7,765
11.....	6,860	7,095	7,330	7,565	7,800	8,035	8,270
Temporary rate.....	7,100	7,335	7,570	7,805	8,040	8,275	8,510
12.....	7,545	7,805	8,065	8,325	8,585	8,845	9,105
Temporary rate.....	7,785	8,045	8,305	8,565	8,825	9,085	9,345
13.....	8,310	8,590	8,870	9,150	9,430	9,710	9,990
Temporary rate.....	8,550	8,830	9,110	9,390	9,670	9,950	10,230
14.....	9,140	9,440	9,740	10,040	10,340	10,640	10,940
Temporary rate.....	9,380	9,680	9,980	10,280	10,580	10,880	11,180

"Postal field service schedule—Continued

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
15.....	\$10,050	\$10,350	\$10,650	\$10,950	\$11,250	\$11,550	\$11,850
Temporary rate.....	10,290	10,590	10,890	11,190	11,490	11,790	12,090
16.....	11,075	11,375	11,675	11,975	12,275	12,575	12,875
Temporary rate.....	11,315	11,615	11,915	12,215	12,515	12,815	13,115
17.....	12,255	12,555	12,855	13,155	13,455	13,755	14,055
Temporary rate.....	12,495	12,795	13,095	13,395	13,695	13,995	14,295
18.....	13,760	14,060	14,360	14,660	14,960	15,260	15,560
19.....	15,000	15,300	15,600	15,900			
20.....	16,000						

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, through inadvertence in the printing of the amendment on page 1, line 1, there is a reference to "page 2" of the pending amendment. I believe that reference should be page 4 of the pending amendment. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that that reference be corrected to read "page 4" of the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to increase the emergency pay of postal supervisors. They fall in levels 6 through 9, immediately above the postal carriers and clerks.

Roughly, this amendment, if adopted, would cost approximately \$7,400,000 a year. There are 326,000 postal employees under the Postal Field Service table. Of that number, more than 300,000 are included in levels 1 through 5. Under the Johnston amendment they would receive an emergency cost of living increase of \$240 a year. Under the Johnston amendment, level 6 of supervisors would receive an increase of \$160 a year as a cost of living increase. Level 7 would receive \$80; and levels 8 and 9, nothing.

It is my understanding that the Chairman will accept the amendment if I delete from it the temporary increase provided for levels 10 through 17. I ask unanimous consent that in the amendment I offered, the temporary rate figures opposite lines 10 through 17 be deleted, so that the temporary cost of living increases which this amendment proposes will be limited to levels 6, 7, 8, and 9 in the amendment as printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the right to modify his amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask my friend from Texas what his justification is for eliminating the temporary pay increases in the five grades to which he has referred?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. My information is that the chairman of the subcommittee would accept the amendment if those levels were deleted. Inasmuch as they embrace higher pay brackets, the cost of living emergency is not so great as it is in the case of the lower grades.

Will the chairman accept the amendment?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. About 8 years ago the junior Senator from Louisiana had the opportunity of serving as chairman of the subcommittee dealing with postal pay. The thing that impressed me most was the failure, time and time again, of the Senate committee to provide for the supervisors. There were situations in which supervisors were receiving less pay than those they were supposed to supervise.

Sometimes it seemed to me that it was planned that way. However, it was more because the carriers and the clerks had very able and effective representation, and they had much greater numbers, they had more votes than did the supervisors. It did not make much sense to me to go along year after year raising the salaries of clerks and carriers, but not supervisors. I am for the clerk and carriers, but I am also for other Government employees.

As I understand, the Senator from Texas proposes to modify his amendment so that pay increases for supervisors would cease after the \$5,000 a year bracket was reached.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I withdraw the proposed modification, in the hope that the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment as originally offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas now remodifies his amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I withdraw the suggested modification in the hope that the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment as it was originally offered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does the amendment go through level 17?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this proposal is contrary to our effort to compensate for the meager pay of letter carriers, who are consigned to be letter carriers all their lives. They remain in the first five grades. There is not one chance in a thousand that they will ever be promoted above the top grade of letter carrier.

We tried to make up for their low pay level and lack of promotional opportunity by giving them a \$240 temporary cost-of-living increase, in addition to the 7½ percent. If we are to apply this increase to employees making \$10,000 a year, we shall be distorting the pay scale

beyond the point of a cost-of-living increase for the lower grades.

Every one of the employees whom the distinguished Senator is now seeking to aid has great opportunities for promotion. That is why we do not have the same program in the classified pay bill. A stenographer may start as a GS-2, and she may become a GS-5 or a GS-7 in a few years. However, these men carry the mail day after day. They start as carriers and they retire as carriers. Their advancement opportunities are one in a thousand. For that reason we tried to combine justice with business and take care of the hardship cases.

If the Senator wishes to advocate better pay for supervisors, I am for that; but I am not for putting such a provision in this bill as a temporary cost-of-living increase. We should handle that subject in another piece of legislation to provide better compensation for other types of work.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in 1955 we increased the salaries of these employees. The Senator's amendment would include all postmasters and supervisors. Some of them would receive increases of as much as 62 percent. There was a graduated scale throughout. The situation in regard to increases in pay was taken care of. When the committee was writing the bill, we tried to take care of various situations, looking back at what we had done in the past.

I believe that the amendment which the Senator from Texas has offered goes a little too far.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I did not have the privilege of being present and participating in the 1955 experience, as did the distinguished chairman of the committee, who has given so many years of effort and service as chairman of the Senate Committee on Post, Office and Civil Service. He has been constantly engaged in an effort to improve the Federal service. I pay tribute to him now.

In the light of the explanation with respect to the 1955 experience, I reoffer the modification first offered, and ask the distinguished chairman of the committee to accept the proposal for temporary increases in levels 6, 7, 8, and 9, which are supervisory grades. Those employees act in a management capacity. They must wear better clothes. They must incur expenses which letter carriers do not have to incur normally. There should be some spread to take care of the supervisory or management employees.

I submit the modified amendment, to increase by \$240 a year, or \$20 a month, at the emergency level, the salaries of supervisors in grades 6, 7, 8, and 9, only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The re-modification is becoming more and more complicated.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have no authority from the committee to accept the amendment. I have not discussed the amendment with members of the committee. I do not see how I could accept it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2729

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that this is one of the amendments which were voted down overwhelmingly in the committee?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am not certain.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the Senator will further yield, this is a good example of how not to handle a bill on the floor. We have been engaged in the consideration of the bill for a week, with amendments coming from everywhere, many of them misunderstood. Others have only very narrow application. We are taking the bill out of the hands of the committee, which worked on it for 6 months.

Let us vote on the pending amendment, and let it stand or fall on its merits, if we can determine how many grades are being affected by the \$240 cost-of-living emergency increase.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to support what the Senator from Oklahoma has said. If we are going to take care of the supervisors further, we should do it in a separate bill after orderly hearings have been held on the subject. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Compensation of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I wish to tell the Senator from Texas that I shall be glad to join him in introducing a bill, and that we shall hold hearings on it. I shall be glad to have him as the first witness.

I wish to say to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] that the supervisors are ably represented here in Washington by some very outstanding people, who will be welcomed as witnesses. I join fully in what the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has said, that the most discriminated against group of employees in the United States Government they are the letter carriers and the mail clerks. That is true so far as pay is concerned and so far as opportunity for advancement is concerned. If we are going to add a cost-of-living bonus to the pay of all kinds of employees in the higher grades, we will merely dilute the bill and, second, imperil it. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that I personally will promise him that we will hold separate hearings on the pay, security, tenure, and conditions of welfare of postal supervisors, if he will go along with the distinguished chairman of the committee and withdraw the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I regret the decision of my distinguished colleague from Texas to modify his amendment. Had it been pressed, I would have supported it. I should like to associate myself with the comments of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]. I believe that the supervisors are just as much entitled to a percentage raise as anyone else. It was for that reason that I supported the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question, because I know he has had wide experience in personnel management. Is it his understanding or his belief that a \$240 cost-of-living bonus should be given to everybody in the postal service?

Mr. CLARK. It is my belief that the so-called cost-of-living bonus would destroy a system of differentiation based upon degree of responsibility, longevity, and many other sound reasons in the field of personnel administration. It is not right, and for that reason I supported the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the Senator what he would do about hundreds of thousands of employees and their families who get approximately \$4,000 a year.

Mr. CLARK. I would give them an adequate pay increase, far more than 8½ percent. However, two wrongs do not make a right.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. NEUBERGER. In order to give them enough to live on, would the Senator raise the pay of every employee in the postal scale, including those who receive \$16,000 or \$18,000 a year, so that the employee at the bottom can have enough with which to feed his family?

Mr. CLARK. I believe the \$16,000 employee is entitled to an increase in view of the cost of living, and for other reasons.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Kansas; then the Senator from Ohio; then the Senator from South Carolina. The Chair will recognize each Senator in turn in an orderly fashion.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to make the observation that some of use on this side of the aisle get a great deal of delight out of this discussion. The Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is trying to help some of the top-paid employees in the postal service. We have a Republican Postmaster General for the first time in many years, and it is now proposed by the Senator from Texas to give him a raise.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask some questions on the amendment.

Do I correctly understand that if the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is adopted, the postal-rate bill will be combined with the postal-pay bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. When it is submitted to a final vote, if a Member of the Senate is in favor of one and against the other, he will not be able to choose between the two, but will have to vote for both or for neither?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I to understand further that if the bill goes to the Presi-

dent, if he is in favor of one-half of it and is not in favor of the other half, he will have to accept it all or nothing at all?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct. The Senator from Ohio has been Governor of his State and I have been Governor of my State. Practically every bill that came before me had something in it that I liked and something that I did not like, and I had to make my decision on it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I always felt deeply aggrieved that the Legislature deliberately tied together a bad bill and a good bill and in that way tried to force it down my throat.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have had that experience.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is wrong to tie them together, if that is the purpose. I am not saying it is the purpose. Secondly, how much would it cost the taxpayers of the United States if the same treatment were given to all the employees of the United States Government who fall in the categories that are being benefited by the bill? Is the Senator able to tell us? What will be the total cost when we get through?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The total cost, when we get through, will be somewhere around \$700 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. \$700 million?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Approximately.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is only for the postal employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Some amendments have been eliminated, and some have been added.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The pending bill will cost about \$300 million. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Ohio is correct. Increases in the bill will cost \$309 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It will cost \$309 million for 500,000 employees. If there are 2,300,000 employees in all, then it will cost about 4.3 times \$309 million? Is that correct? That is a figure I arrived at rather rapidly. I would conclude that cost will be \$1,500,000,000.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is taking into consideration the employees who come under the wage board. They have already been taken care of, and the increases to them do not fall into this bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It will cost \$1,500,000,000. I want to know how the taxpayers will—

Mr. NEUBERGER. In the two bills there are only about a million and a half employees involved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing—

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I first wish to ask the Senator from Texas to withdraw his amendment. I assure him we will study the subject in committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas withdraw his amendment?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. While I regard the erroneous arguments of the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania and the wholly erroneous

arguments of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, my good friends, as totally inadequate reasons for the withdrawal of the amendment, since the postal pay bill will cost \$309 million, and a simple act of justice to 44,000 supervisors, under my proposal, would cost only \$408,000, in the light of the request of the distinguished chairman of the committee, who is responsible for the bill, I will accede to his request and withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas requests that his amendment, as modified, be withdrawn. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I withdraw it at the request of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I merely wish to make it clear that I intended to support the Senator from Texas, and I have told some people that I intended to do so. I wanted that statement recorded in the Record. I am sorry to see the amendment withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Do I understand that the pending amendment is the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is our intention to have a vote as early as we can. Several Senators intend to leave town, and if that happens, and if we keep telling the postal workers how much we love them instead of voting, we may wind up by not adopting the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I appreciate the courteous admonition of the majority leader. I merely wish to say that I had assured many people that I would support a reasonable and justifiable and long overdue adjustment for postal supervisors, and that if I had a chance to do so I would do it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I can explain my amendment.

It simply provides that we shall do for the supervisors what is proposed to be done for everyone else in the bill. Anyone who tells me that this is a temporary increase for those in the lower brackets is not correctly informed. I do not think there is a Member of the Senate who actually thinks that the temporary increase will expire, and that we will vote not to continue it. If anyone thinks he will not vote to extend the increase when it expires, I wish he would stand up and let me get a good look at him. This will be a permanent increase.

We say to a man, "You are low paid or underpaid, you cannot get a job somewhere else. You are a veteran. You were injured, perhaps slightly, during the war. You are a 10-point veteran. You will get the Government job if you make only 60 on the exam in preference

to the man who makes a hundred. You will keep your job when others who have been here longer cannot keep theirs, even though they might be better qualified for the job."

If those people are to get a pay raise, then those who have been around for a long time as supervisors, working day in and day out, the people who are staying with the post office as a matter of loyalty, although they could get better jobs elsewhere, but because they have certain seniority rights want to stay with the Government, should also receive a raise. Those latter people are not nearly so numerous in the Post Office.

I am willing to give a pay raise to those who are numerically the strongest. On the other hand, I do not wish to leave out the faithful supervisors who, year in and year out, are confronted with the same cost of living increase. Their cost of living has gone up as much as it has for anyone else.

Mr. President, the bill without this amendment does not make sense to me. I had the honor of advocating top pay for those in the Cabinet. I had the honor of advocating that the top people in the Government receive top pay, because it has been stated time and time again that if efficiency is desired, we must get good supervisors just as we get good day workers. If we can take care of those at the top and those at the bottom, why not those in the middle?

To leave out the supervisors, year in and year out, the way I have seen it done time and again during the past 8 years, does not make sense. For my part, I should like to give them a pay raise, if I am the only Senator who votes for it.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have explained that this amendment is for the purpose of offering an opportunity for the supervisors to have a pay raise at the same time we undertake to raise the pay of the postal clerks and carriers.

The amendment was originally offered by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. It seems fair to me.

I am frank to say that I have seen provision for the supervisors left out time and time again when pay-raise bills were being acted upon.

I have told the clerks and carriers that I will support the bill to increase their pay; and I will. But it seems to me it would not be fair to omit provision for increasing the pay of the supervisors. While we raise the pay of those who are in the lower classes, we should also provide for an increase in the pay of those who are the supervisors.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge that my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. [Putting the question.]

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on this question, I request the yeas and nays.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I join in the request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], for himself and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senators from Missouri [Mr. HENNING and Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—50

Aiken	Clark	Hoblitzell
Allott	Dirksen	Hruska
Barrett	Douglas	Humphrey
Bennett	Eastland	Jackson
Bricker	Ellender	Kefauver
Bush	Flanders	Knowland
Carlson	Frear	Langer
Carroll	Hickenlooper	Long
Case, S. Dak.	Hill	Magnuson

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2731

Mansfield
McClellan
McNamara
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murray
Pastore

Potter
Proxmire
Purtell
Revercomb
Russell
Saltonstall
Smith, Maine
Sparkman

Stennis
Thurmond
Thye
Watkins
Wiley
Yarborough
Young

Neuberger
Payne

Scott

Williams

NOT VOTING—15

Byrd
Capehart
Chavez
Curtis
Fulbright

Hennings
Ives
Martin, Iowa
O'Mahoney
Robertson

Schoeppel
Smathers
Smith, N. J.
Symington
Talmadge

NAYS—31

Anderson
Beall
Bible
Bridges
Butler
Case, N. J.
Church
Cooper
Cotton

Dworshak
Ervin
Goldwater
Gore
Green
Hayden
Holland
Javits
Jenner

Johnson, Tex.
Johnston, S. C.
Kennedy
Kerr
Kuchel
Lausche
Malone
Martin, Pa.
Monroney

So the amendment offered by Mr. LONG, for himself and Mr. YARBOROUGH, to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] was agreed to, as follows:

On page 2, in lieu of the schedule appearing between lines 2 and 3 insert the following:

"Postal field service schedule

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
1. Temporary rate.....	\$3,095	\$3,205	\$3,315	\$3,425	\$3,535	\$3,645	\$3,755
2. Temporary rate.....	3,335	3,445	3,555	3,665	3,775	3,885	3,995
3. Temporary rate.....	3,320	3,435	3,550	3,665	3,780	3,895	4,010
4. Temporary rate.....	3,560	3,675	3,790	3,905	4,020	4,135	4,250
5. Temporary rate.....	3,580	3,705	3,830	3,955	4,080	4,205	4,330
6. Temporary rate.....	3,820	3,945	4,070	4,195	4,320	4,445	4,570
7. Temporary rate.....	3,935	4,070	4,205	4,340	4,475	4,610	4,745
8. Temporary rate.....	4,175	4,310	4,445	4,580	4,715	4,850	4,985
9. Temporary rate.....	4,170	4,305	4,440	4,575	4,710	4,845	4,980
10. Temporary rate.....	4,410	4,545	4,680	4,815	4,950	5,085	5,220
11. Temporary rate.....	4,505	4,655	4,805	4,955	5,105	5,255	5,405
12. Temporary rate.....	4,745	4,895	5,045	5,195	5,345	5,495	5,645
13. Temporary rate.....	4,870	5,035	5,200	5,365	5,530	5,695	5,860
14. Temporary rate.....	5,110	5,275	5,440	5,605	5,770	5,935	6,100
15. Temporary rate.....	5,255	5,440	5,625	5,810	5,995	6,180	6,365
16. Temporary rate.....	5,495	5,680	5,865	6,050	6,235	6,420	6,605
17. Temporary rate.....	5,675	5,875	6,075	6,275	6,475	6,675	6,875
18. Temporary rate.....	5,915	6,115	6,315	6,515	6,715	6,915	7,115
19. Temporary rate.....	6,235	6,450	6,665	6,880	7,095	7,310	7,525
20. Temporary rate.....	6,475	6,690	6,905	7,120	7,335	7,550	7,765
21. Temporary rate.....	6,860	7,095	7,330	7,565	7,800	8,035	8,270
22. Temporary rate.....	7,100	7,335	7,570	7,805	8,040	8,275	8,510
23. Temporary rate.....	7,545	7,805	8,065	8,325	8,585	8,845	9,105
24. Temporary rate.....	7,785	8,045	8,305	8,565	8,825	9,085	9,345
25. Temporary rate.....	8,310	8,590	8,870	9,150	9,430	9,710	9,990
26. Temporary rate.....	8,550	8,830	9,110	9,390	9,670	9,950	10,230
27. Temporary rate.....	9,140	9,440	9,740	10,040	10,340	10,640	10,940
28. Temporary rate.....	9,380	9,680	9,980	10,280	10,580	10,880	11,180
29. Temporary rate.....	10,060	10,360	10,660	10,960	11,260	11,560	11,860
30. Temporary rate.....	10,290	10,590	10,890	11,190	11,490	11,790	12,090
31. Temporary rate.....	11,075	11,375	11,675	11,975	12,275	12,575	12,875
32. Temporary rate.....	11,315	11,615	11,915	12,215	12,515	12,815	13,115
33. Temporary rate.....	12,255	12,555	12,855	13,155	13,455	13,755	14,055
34. Temporary rate.....	12,495	12,795	13,095	13,395	13,695	13,995	14,295
35. Temporary rate.....	13,760	14,060	14,360	14,660	14,960	15,260	15,560
36. Temporary rate.....	15,000	15,300	15,600	15,900			
37. Temporary rate.....	16,000						

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Johnston amendment, as amended.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as we are about to reach a final vote on the Johnston amendment, I should like to make a statement to the Senate.

Although I voted for S. 27 in the Senate committee, which is the substance of the pending amendment, I stated at the time I would try to secure a bill which I was confident would be approved and thus provide a much-needed pay increase for postal employees.

I shall support now the Johnston amendment. I shall do everything in my power to secure, in conference, a bill which the President will sign and which the Senate can approve.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was trying to get the floor after the vote by which the Johnston postal pay amendment was tied to the postal rate bill. I should like to have the record show that I voted

against uniting the two bills. Previously, I was in favor of uniting the two bills. However, I believe the Senate, by majority vote, has taken very unwise action, and action which is discriminatory against postal employees in the lower grades.

I desire the record to show that I voted against the motion to tie the two bills together.

Mr. LAUSCHE subsequently said: Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber when the vote was taken on the Johnston amendment. I want the record to show that if I had been present I would have voted against the amendment. I would have voted against it because we are combining two subjects which are not germane to each other. I think it is unfair to the Members of the Senate and to the President of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Several Senators addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to return to an amendment agreed to by the Senate yesterday, which I offered, and which provided free postage privi-

leges to members of the armed services overseas. The amendment refers to Army and fleet post offices. I want the RECORD to show very clearly that when I used the word "Army" in the amendment, I used it in the generic sense. The term used was intended to cover the Military Establishment; but in order to make legislative history, and so there can be no question as to the meaning of the amendment, the RECORD should show that the Air Force has called the majority leader's office—and I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this matter—and also has been in touch with the staff of the committee. It wants to have the statement made, which I am now making on the floor of the Senate, that my amendment covers the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy, although we have always referred to the Army post offices as including Air Force post offices. Apparently some so-called Air post offices have been established. The amendment also include the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard. In other words, it includes each and all branches of the military service.

I am advised by counsel that this statement of mine will certainly suffice, at least if this matter goes to conference; but I want it definitely understood that my amendment covers the Army post offices, the Air post offices, and the so-called Fleet and Navy post offices, as well as the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Oregon include in his amendment mail sent by members of the Coast Guard and Marine Corps, too?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I have so stated. As I said yesterday, and let this be clearly understood as a matter of definition, my amendment uses the term "Army" in the generic sense. It includes the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the so-called foot soldiers, Air Force, and Navy.

If anybody wishes to make any exception to that statement, he ought to make it now.

We can save time, by my not having to resubmit the amendment adding other classifications, if it is understood the term "Army" is used in the generic sense.

Does the chairman of the committee understand the intent?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the chairman of the committee agree to take the amendment to conference with that understanding?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Carolina will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add a new title at the end of the bill, "Title V—Increases in Compensation of Employees Generally," it modifies the Classification Act of 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the amendment will be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The amendment proposed by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

"Grade

GS-1	\$2,890
GS-2	3,180
GS-3	3,415
GS-4	3,670
GS-5	3,945
GS-6	4,385
GS-7	4,805
GS-8	5,345
GS-9	5,850
GS-10	6,360
GS-11	6,870
GS-12	8,140
GS-13	9,750
GS-14	11,250
GS-15	12,600
GS-16	14,000
GS-17	15,500
GS-18	17,500

At the end of the bill insert the following new title:

"TITLE V—INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES GENERALLY

"SEC. 501. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Employees Pay Act of 1958.'

"SEC. 502. (a) Section 603 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1113 (b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

Per annum rates

\$2,980	\$3,070	\$3,160	\$3,250	\$3,340	\$3,430
3,270	3,360	3,450	3,540	3,630	3,720
3,505	3,595	3,685	3,775	3,865	3,955
3,760	3,850	3,940	4,030	4,120	4,210
4,090	4,235	4,380	4,525	4,670	4,815
4,530	4,675	4,820	4,965	5,110	5,255
5,010	5,155	5,300	5,445	5,590	5,735
5,490	5,635	5,780	5,925	6,070	6,215
5,995	6,140	6,285	6,430	6,575	6,720
6,505	6,650	6,795	6,940	7,085	7,230
7,100	7,330	7,560	7,790	8,020	
8,370	8,600	8,830	9,060	9,290	
10,000	10,250	10,500	10,750	11,000	
11,500	11,750	12,000	12,250	12,500	
12,900	13,200	13,500	13,800		
14,300	14,600	14,900	15,200		
15,800	16,100	16,400	16,700		

"(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be adjusted as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates of a grade in the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date.

"(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between 2 scheduled or 2 longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the general schedule, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate he received immediately prior to such effective date increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the next lower scheduled rate of his grade.

"(3) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph (4) of this subsection), immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he received immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate, or the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, of his grade until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but, when his position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended.

"(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2 (b) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208 (b) of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111; Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), plus the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of (A) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under such section 208 (b) of the act of

September 1, 1954, and (B) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, and (C) the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208 (b) of such act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing aggregate rate of compensation of such employee.

"(5) If the officer or employee, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this act, was promoted from one grade under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to another such grade at a rate which is above the minimum rate thereof, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively from the effective date of this section to the date on which he was so promoted, on the basis of the rate which he was receiving during the period from such effective date to the date of such promotion and, from the date of such promotion, on the basis of the rate for that step of the appropriate grade of the general schedule contained in this section which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the general schedule for such officer or employee which was in effect (without regard to this title) at the time of such promotion.

"(6) Except as provided in paragraph (7) of this subsection, if the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the date of enactment of this act as a result of action taken under section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C. 1133), he shall receive the higher of either (A) a rate of basic compensation at the scheduled rate in effect on the effective date of this section to which he would have been entitled under the provisions of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 1121) had such action under section 803 not been taken, or (B) a rate of basic compensation at the scheduled rate in effect on such effective date which is equal to his existing rate, or if there is no such scheduled rate equal to his existing rate, then

at the next higher scheduled rate: *Provided*, That upon approval by the Civil Service Commission, based upon a determination that such action is equitable, any such employee may be paid at any scheduled rate not in excess of the rate which he was receiving on the date of enactment of this act, adjusted in accordance with paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection.

"(7) If the officer or employee has had his rate of basic compensation adjusted, under authority of section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C. 1133), at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this title and ending on the date of enactment of this act—

"(A) his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively in accordance with the initial conversion rules prescribed in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection for the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the effective date of such adjustment under such section 803, on the basis of the rate or rates which he was receiving during such period, and

"(B) on and after the effective date of such adjustment under such section 803, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation adjusted in accordance with paragraph (6) of this subsection.

"(8) If the officer or employee, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this act, became subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, at a rate of basic compensation which was fixed on the basis of a higher previously earned rate and which is above the minimum rate of the grade of such officer or employee, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively to the date on which he became subject to such act, on the basis of the rate for that step of the appropriate grade of the general schedule contained in this section which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the general schedule for such officer or employee which was in effect (without regard to this title) at the time he became subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(9) Each officer or employee—

"(A) (i) who with his position has been transferred under authority of the Classification Act of 1949, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this act, from the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 to a prevailing rate schedule, or (ii) who, at any time during such period, transferred from a position subject to the Classification Act of 1949 to a position subject to a prevailing rate schedule,

"(B) who, at all times subsequent to such transfer, was in the service of the United States (including the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, without break in such service of more than 30 consecutive calendar days and, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, without break in service in excess of the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"(C) who, on such date of enactment, is being compensated under a prevailing rate schedule, and

"(D) whose rate of basic compensation on such date of enactment is less than the rate to which he would have been entitled on such date if such transfer had not occurred (unless he is receiving such lesser rate by reason of an adverse personnel action resulting from his own fault),

shall be paid basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he would have been receiving on such date of enactment (including compensation for each within-grade and longevity step-increase which he would have earned) if such transfer had not occurred until the day immediately following such date of enactment, for all time in a pay status on and after the effective date of this section in a position subject to a prevailing rate schedule under the circumstances prescribed in this subsection, until—

"(a) he leaves the position which he holds on such date of enactment, or

"(b) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate under a prevailing rate schedule; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with prevailing rate schedules.

"Sec. 503. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C., sec. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, section 604 (a) (5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by section 502 of this act in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(b) The limitations of \$13,485 and \$18,010 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges contained in the paragraph under the heading 'Salaries of Supporting Personnel' in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1958, or in any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this title.

"(c) Section 753 (e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out '\$6,450' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$6,935'.

"Sec. 504. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 7.5 percent of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

"(b) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act, to the lowest multiple of \$60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that (1) the provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the 15th day following the date of enactment of this act the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish this subsection to apply to such employee, and (2) no increase in compensation shall result from such adjustment in basic compensation for any period prior to the date thereof.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (d), the rates of gross compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the Legislative Counsel and senior counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the House of Repre-

sentatives, the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by 7.5 percent.

"(d) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading 'Senate' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, is amended to read as follows:

"No officer or employee, whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of \$8,880 per annum, or gross compensation at a rate in excess of \$16,000 per annum, unless expressly authorized by law."

"(e) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in the paragraph designated 'Folding documents' under the heading 'Contingent Expenses of the Senate' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1958, or in any subsequent appropriation act, but the limitations contained in such paragraph are hereby increased by the amounts necessary to provide increases corresponding to those provided by subsection (a).

"(f) The Official Reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees shall be considered to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government within the meaning of subsection (a).

"(g) The additional compensation provided by subsection (a) shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

"(h) The paragraph relating to rates of compensation of employees of committees of the Senate, contained in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, is amended by striking out so much of the second sentence thereof as follows the words 'First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947,' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'the basic compensation of any employee of a standing or select committee of the Senate (including the majority and minority policy committees and the majority conference of the Senate and the minority conference of the Senate), or a joint committee of the two Houses the expenses of which are paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, whose basic compensation may be fixed under such provisions at a rate of \$8,000 per annum, may be fixed at a rate not in excess of \$8,040 per annum, except that the basic compensation of 1 such employee may be fixed at a rate not in excess of \$8,880 per annum and the basic compensation of 2 such employees may be fixed at a rate not in excess of \$8,460 per annum.'

"(i) No officer or employee shall be paid increased or additional compensation for any period prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act at a rate in excess of 7.5 percent of his gross rate of compensation computed without regard to the amendment made by subsection (d).

"(j) The position of Chief Nurse in the Senate Office Building, under the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, shall be established and allocated to grade 9 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, so long as such position is held by the present incumbent.

"Sec. 505. (a) The last sentence of section 1403 (d) of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 130; Public Law 85-56), relating to the annual salaries of the directors of service or chiefs of division of the Depart-

ment of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration is amended by striking out '\$13,225 minimum to \$14,300 maximum' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$14,300 minimum to \$15,200 maximum.'

"(b) Section 1403 (e) of such act, relating to the annual salaries of the Director of Nursing Service and the Deputy Director of Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

"(1) by striking out '\$11,610' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$12,600'; and

"(2) by striking out '\$10,320' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$11,250'.

"(c) Section 1403 (f) of such act, relating to the annual salaries of the chief pharmacist, the chief dietician, the chief physical therapist, and the chief occupational therapist of the department of medicine and surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out '\$10,320' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$11,250'.

"(d) Section 1407 (a) of such act, relating to maximum and minimum annual rates of salary of certain employees of the medical service, dental service, and nursing service of the department of medicine and surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows: "'(a) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 1404 shall be as follows:

"MEDICAL SERVICE

"Chief grade, \$12,600 minimum to \$13,800 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$11,250 minimum to \$12,500 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$9,750 minimum to \$11,000 maximum.

"Full grade, \$8,140 minimum to \$9,290 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$6,870 minimum to \$8,020 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$6,360 minimum to \$7,230 maximum.

"DENTAL SERVICE

"Chief grade, \$12,600 minimum to \$13,800 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$11,250 minimum to \$12,500 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$9,750 minimum to \$11,000 maximum.

"Full grade, \$8,140 minimum to \$9,290 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$6,870 minimum to \$8,020 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$6,360 minimum to \$7,230 maximum.

"NURSING SERVICE

"Assistant director, \$8,140 minimum to \$9,290 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$6,870 minimum to \$8,020 maximum.

"Full grade, \$5,850 minimum to \$6,720 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$5,085 minimum to \$6,010 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$4,330 minimum to \$5,250 maximum."

"(e) Section 1408 (d) of such act, prescribing the maximum amount of pay and allowances of medical, surgical, and dental specialists of the department of medicine and surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out '\$13,760' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$15,200'.

"Sec. 506. The Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(a) The schedule contained in section 412 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Class 1.....	\$16,000	\$16,500	\$16,940	\$17,380	\$17,500				
Class 2.....	13,860	14,190	14,520	14,850	15,180	\$15,510	\$15,840		
Class 3.....	11,550	11,880	12,210	12,540	12,870	13,200	13,530		
Class 4.....	9,765	10,040	10,315	10,590	10,865	11,140	11,415		
Class 5.....	7,955	8,225	8,495	8,765	9,035	9,305	9,575		
Class 6.....	6,560	6,775	6,990	7,205	7,420	7,635	7,850		
Class 7.....	5,485	5,645	5,805	5,965	6,125	6,285	6,445		
Class 8.....	4,625	4,785	4,945	5,105	5,265	5,425	5,585	\$5,745	

"(b) Section 415 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 415. There shall be 22 classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees,

"Class 1.....	\$11,770	\$12,120	\$12,470	\$12,820	\$13,170	
Class 2.....	10,815	11,115	11,415	11,715	12,015	
Class 3.....	9,895	10,175	10,455	10,735	11,015	
Class 4.....	8,890	9,165	9,440	9,715	9,990	
Class 5.....	8,200	8,435	8,670	8,905	9,140	\$9,375
Class 6.....	7,515	7,725	7,935	8,145	8,355	8,565
Class 7.....	6,830	7,035	7,240	7,445	7,650	7,855
Class 8.....	6,145	6,350	6,555	6,760	6,965	7,170
Class 9.....	5,455	5,660	5,865	6,070	6,275	6,480
Class 10.....	5,000	5,175	5,350	5,525	5,700	5,875
Class 11.....	4,540	4,680	4,820	4,960	5,100	5,240
Class 12.....	4,085	4,225	4,365	4,505	4,645	4,785
Class 13.....	3,645	3,785	3,925	4,065	4,205	4,345
Class 14.....	3,225	3,365	3,505	3,645	3,785	3,925
Class 15.....	3,020	3,125	3,230	3,335	3,440	3,545
Class 16.....	2,810	2,880	2,950	3,020	3,090	3,160
Class 17.....	2,600	2,670	2,740	2,810	2,880	2,950
Class 18.....	2,395	2,465	2,535	2,605	2,675	2,745
Class 19.....	2,190	2,260	2,330	2,400	2,470	2,540
Class 20.....	1,980	2,050	2,120	2,190	2,260	2,330
Class 21.....	1,770	1,840	1,910	1,980	2,050	2,120
Class 22.....	1,565	1,635	1,705	1,775	1,845	1,915

"Sec. 507. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1105), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) The Administrator of the United States Courts is authorized to place a total of four positions in grade 17 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by subsection (b)."

"Sec. 508. Section 505 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out 'twelve hundred and twenty-six' and inserting 'eighteen hundred', by striking out 'three hundred and twenty-nine' and inserting 'four hundred and seventy-five', and by striking out 'one hundred and thirty' and inserting 'one hundred and ninety'."

"Sec. 509. (a) The first section of the act of August 1, 1947 (Public Law 313, 80th Cong.), as amended is amended by striking out 'one hundred and twenty' and 'twenty-five' in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof 'four hundred and fifty' and 'fifty', respectively.

"(b) Such section is further amended by striking out 'thirty' in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof 'one hundred and fifty'."

"(c) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 10 scientific or professional positions in the Department of the Interior, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than five scientific or professional positions in the Department of Agriculture, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(f) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than five scientific or professional positions in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(g) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 50 scientific or professional positions in the Department of Commerce, each such position being established to effectuate those research and de-

velopment functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel."

"(d) Section 3 of such act is amended by inserting after 'Secretary of Defense' a comma and the following: 'the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and by inserting after 'Military Establishment' a comma and the following: 'the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.'"

"Sec. 510. The Chief and the Assistant Chief of the Training and Standards Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health shall be paid basic compensation at the rate of \$17,500 per annum, except that if the person holding either such office is subject to the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, such person shall be paid such compensation as, when added to his pay and allowances under such act, will cause his total compensation to be at the rate of \$17,500 per annum.

"Sec. 511. Except as provided in sections 4 (c) and 9, (1) no rate of compensation or salary which is \$17,500 or more per annum shall be increased by reason of this act, and (2) no rate of compensation or salary shall be increased by reason of this title to an amount in excess of \$17,500 per annum.

"Sec. 512. (a) During the calendar quarter beginning on April 1, 1958, no appointment may be made to any civilian office or position in the executive branch of the Government.

"(b) During any calendar quarter beginning after July 1, 1958, the total number of appointments made to civilian offices and positions in the executive branch of the Government shall not exceed a number equal to one-third of the vacancies which occurred in such offices and positions during the preceding calendar quarter.

"(c) As used in this section, the terms 'office' and 'position' shall not include—

"(1) any office or position required to be filled by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(2) a postmaster of the fourth class;

"(3) any office or position filled from within the department or agency;

"(4) any office or position held by an officer or employee paid wholly from a trust fund, or a fund derived from a trust account;

"(5) any office or position held by an employee employed without compensation;

"(6) any position held by a seasonal or casual worker;

"(7) any office or position the filling of which is determined by the President to be necessary to the effective administration, execution, and operation of the national

health, security, welfare, and management functions and activities of the Government;

"(8) any office or position filled by any person in the exercise of reemployment rights under section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act or any other provision of law conferring reemployment rights upon persons who have performed active duty in the Armed Forces, or by any person required to be restored to an office or position pursuant to an order of the Civil Service Commission or of any court; and

"(9) any office or position in the General Accounting Office.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply during any calendar quarter if at the end of the preceding calendar quarter the aggregate number of full-time civilian officers and employees (including the full-time equivalent of part-time employment but excluding employees holding positions referred to in subsection (c) (4), (5), and (6)) does not exceed 2,150,000 or such other figure as may be established from time to time by Executive order of the President.

"(e) The President may authorize the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"(f) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not be construed to prohibit any appointment which is made pursuant to a commitment made prior to the date of enactment of this act.

"Sec. 513. (a) (1) Clause (2) of that paragraph of section 602 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1112), which defines the level of difficulty and responsibility of work in grade 5 of the General Schedule (GS-5) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to perform, under immediate supervision, and with little opportunity for the exercise of independent judgment, simple and elementary work requiring professional, scientific, or technical training; or"

"(2) Clause (2) of that paragraph of the same section which defines the level of difficulty and responsibility of work in grade 7 of the General Schedule (GS-7) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) under immediate or general supervision, to perform somewhat difficult work requiring (A) professional, scientific, or technical training, and (B) to a limited extent, the exercise of independent technical judgment; or"

"(b) The Civil Service Commission shall exercise its authority to issue such standards or regulations as may be necessary for the administration of subsection (a) of this section.

"SEC. 514. (a) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law, and are not otherwise increased by this act are hereby authorized to be increased, effective on or after the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1957, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this title for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

"(b) Any appropriation required to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, may be apportioned on a basis indicating the need for a supplemental or deficiency estimate of appropriation to the extent necessary to permit payment of such increases as may be granted officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law, but only to the extent that such increases do not exceed the increases

provided by this title for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

"(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize any increase in the rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

"Sec. 515. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this title only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1957, and ending on the date of enactment of this act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Cong.), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1957, and ending on the date of enactment of this act by an officer or employee who dies during such period.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 516. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this title shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1957.

"(b) This section and sections 501, 504 (b), 504 (e), 504 (h), 504 (j), 510, 514, and 515, shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

"(c) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this title shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of such enactment."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would it be in order to make a motion to recommit the bill with instructions to report the bill back forthwith without the recently adopted amendment by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long]?

My reason for making this inquiry is that if the bill shall be enacted as amended we shall be setting a pattern for 15 percent pay increases throughout the Federal Government.

We have set a pattern for 7½ percent pay increases in the postal-pay bill, with a \$240 cost-of-living increase for the first 4 or 5 grades.

If the first 17 grades are covered, all grades will be covered, except the specialized, high-level civil-service groups, with pay increases which will average perhaps 12 or 15 percent. Thus, if we

leave the Long amendment in the bill, a pattern will be set for nearly 2 million additional classified workers; and the pattern has always been that they are entitled roughly to the same pay increases as those accorded the postal workers.

Therefore, we can figure on a 12- or 15-percent pay increase for all of the 2½ million civil-service employees of the Government.

If we vote to recommit the bill, and then pass it without the Long amendment, we can go to a conference and have a wide-open conference. We can take out the \$240 cost-of-living increase, modify it downward, or raise the percentage upward, and reach some kind of a sensible agreement. However, if we pass the bill with the Long amendment in it, we not only will involve this country in expending far more money than it is contemplated will be derived from the 5-cent postage stamp and the rates on other services, but we will wind up with a far greater postal deficit than we started with when we took the bill up. We will also set a precedent for industry, which today is plagued with unemployment and with layoffs and part-time work, by saying to all the people who work for industry, "The Federal Government believes in a 15-percent pay increase at a time when the revenue to pay the increase is declining."

Mr. President, I therefore move to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions that it be reported back forthwith after striking the Long amendment, which will leave the bill as it was up to the time the Long amendment was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Senator from Oklahoma propounded a parliamentary inquiry as to whether a motion to recommit would be in order. If the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized, it will be in order. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] now has the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, after conferring with the majority leader on the parliamentary situation I will withhold my motion to recommit for the time being so that we can work out some other parliamentary device by which to accomplish the same purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to state to my colleague from Oklahoma that he is becoming concerned about this matter far too late. I tried to stress this point when we started the consideration of the bill.

We have adopted the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], which provides practically a 12-percent pay increase. I would not become alarmed about \$18 million or \$20 million. Even if we strike out the Long amendment, we will have a 12-percent pay increase bill.

The Senator is concerned about the increases for the classified civil-service employees, for the military personnel, and for those who work in industry, I will state to the Senator that we have now set the pattern. Why worry about

it? We are going to have to work this matter out in conference. I do not think it makes any difference whether a few million dollars are provided for a few employees in the bill. We have nearly 500,000 employees provided for at 12 percent.

Mr. President, I think the worry is coming very late.

Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CARLSON. What is the question pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. CARLSON. Is that amendment open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it is.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will send it to the desk, and the clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, after line 6, of the additional amendment, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph as subsection (b) of section 8, as follows:

(b) Such section is further amended by striking out "thirty-seven" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "seventy-five."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer this amendment because it affects the top employees in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The action suggested would permit the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, United States Department of Justice, who is Mr. Hoover, to place a total of 75 positions in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in grades 16, 17, and 18.

Such positions would be in addition to the number of positions which are authorized to be placed in such grades by the Civil Service Commission.

This amendment is requested because of the increased responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and it is imperative and necessary to place these Bureau position salaries at levels comparable with those of other agencies, in order to provide a sufficient incentive to employees occupying these positions.

I sincerely hope, Mr. President, that the amendment to the amendment will be accepted by the chairman of the committee, in order that it may be considered in conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that the amendment presently pending before the Senate is an amendment to tie the classified employees pay bill to the postal rate bill and the postal pay bill?

Mr. CARLSON. I understand from the Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, that such an amendment is the pending question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator to answer this question: Are

not the problems of the classified employees pay bill quite different from those of the postal employees pay bill? It has always been my understanding that the problems are quite different and that such matters should be considered in separate bills, and that in order to be fair there should be separate classifications and separate increases, if we determine to give the employees an increase.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to state to the Senator from Massachusetts that if I had my way I would not tie the classified pay bill to the postal rate bill and the postal pay bill.

It is my desire to give the classified workers a pay increase which is in keeping with what all Government employees should receive. If we tie the pay increase for those employees to the bill under consideration, in my opinion, it is going to make the situation extremely difficult.

We could pass the classified pay increase bill at a comparable figure of 7½ or 8½ percent, and the employees would be able, within a reasonable time, to receive such increase. That bill could pass the Senate. It could go through the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and through the House, and could be enacted into law.

My personal opinion is that if we tie this amendment to the bill under consideration, the classified employees will be caught in a bind. I do not want to put them in that position.

While I have the floor, Mr. President, I wish to mention that there is another group to whom we should give consideration, and about whom we have had hearings in our committee. I refer to retired employees. There is some proposed legislation with regard to them on the calendar. Let us not single out certain groups. The retirees, who contributed 100 cents on the dollar, are getting back 50 cents on the dollar. I think they are entitled to consideration.

I am not going to move that the Senate take action on that subject today, but I invite the attention of Senators to that situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would it not be more fair to the classified employees at the present time to vote against tying the classified pay bill to the postal rate bill, so that we can vote on that question separately with the hope that we can provide a fair increase for classified employees?

Mr. CARLSON. My personal opinion is that that is the right thing to do. That is the way I shall vote. The pending amendment proposes to tie the matters together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do any other Senators seek recognition?

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the amendment of the Senator from Kansas apply to the classified pay amendment which has been offered by the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CARLSON. It is an amendment to the Classified Act, to increase the compensation of certain employees of the FBI.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to say that it is entirely possible that Senators may vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas, to clarify the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, but I shall not vote to attach the classified pay bill to the pending postal rate bill.

I agree with the Senator that such action would be a mistake. I think it would jeopardize the pay raise for the classified civil service employees, and might tie it up for a prolonged period of time.

As I understand, there is no particular controversy as to the classified pay bill. The classified pay bill as reported from the committee does not diverge very much from the recommendations made by the administration. There is a chance, very soon, of having a classified pay bill passed on its own merits. I hope such a bill will not be attached to the pending postal pay and postal rate bill, which may not become a law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield, if I have the floor, to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to add a statement to what the Senator from California has said.

The Senate has pending before it a pay bill for the military services. That bill should be considered on its merits, just like the classified pay bill should be considered. If the classified pay bill is tied to the postal pay bill, there is no reason why the military pay bill should not be also tied to it.

We should consider these bills separately, as I see it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to my good friend, the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thoroughly approve of the position taken by the Senator from California. There is a justification, in my opinion, for attaching the postal pay bill to the postal rate bill, but I do not think there is any reason whatever for the attaching of the classified pay bill to the postal pay bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. May we have order, Mr. President, so that the Senator may be heard?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from California, and I thank the Presiding Officer.

Whether they realize it or not, Senators are preparing to load up the measure so that nothing helpful can result

from it. There is a relationship between a 5-cent rate for first-class letters and an increase in the salaries of postal employees, and the matter of affording an opportunity to improve postal facilities. Those subjects are tied together. But if Senators attach the classified pay increase measure to the postal rate and postal salary increase bill, in my judgment they will have difficulty in passing the bill. Personally I will not vote for it in that event, and I think other Senators will react likewise.

Furthermore, we would make it much more difficult for the Executive to approve it, and, in my judgment, we would make the problem of the conferees very much more difficult. We would invite those who wish to see a pay increase for the employees and personnel of the armed services to tie that bill to the pending measure. In my judgment we would be riding toward disaster, and taking a real chance of defeating the very legitimate effort of our committee to increase the pay of employees of the postal service in the lower brackets somewhat in conformity with the increase in the cost of living.

I hope Senators will not insist upon tying the classified pay increase bill to the pending measure. If they do, I want it to be known, first, that I will not vote for it. Second, that I do not believe it can be approved in that form. Third, that it would defeat the fine work done by the committee in the effort to improve the position of the postal employees.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I think he has made a very able and cogent argument as to why the classified pay increase bill should not be attached to the pending measure.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in order to reach a clear-cut issue, inasmuch as I understand that my amendment is interfering with that objective, I am willing to withdraw it in order that we may meet the issue as to whether my amendment should be attached to the postal pay bill or whether it should be considered separately.

If the Senate should vote to adopt the Johnston amendment, the bill would not be open to further amendment. I have some amendments which I should like to offer to the bill. I am willing to withdraw my pending amendment in order that the Senate may meet the issue at once.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that would present a clear-cut issue as to whether we are to attach a classified pay bill to the postal rate and postal pay bill.

Mr. CARLSON. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I stated in the beginning that I was opposed to joining the two bills. However, if Senate bill 734 is offered as an amendment to the pending bill and is agreed to, I have an amendment to offer. My

preliminary inquiry is this: Would further amendments to Senate bill 734 be precluded if it should now be adopted as an amendment to the pending bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Johnston amendment would not be open to amendment if it were agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Before there is any disposition of the Johnston amendment, I offer to it an amendment on behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and myself, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 16. It is the sense of the Congress that appropriations for cooperative agricultural extension work and appropriations for payments to State agricultural experiment stations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, and subsequent fiscal years should include additional amounts sufficient to provide increases in the portion of the compensation of persons employed in such work or by such stations, which is paid from such appropriations, corresponding to the increases provided for employees under this act.

On page 26, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "section 16" and insert "section 17."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as I say, I am opposed to the joining of the classified workers' pay bill to the pending postal bill; but if this amendment is not offered now, it will be cut off, and cannot be offered later, should the classified workers' pay bill amendment be adopted.

My amendment is very simple, and it is stated very clearly. In the classified workers' pay bill there are increases for all agricultural workers who are paid by the Federal Government. That leaves the extension workers, who work at the county level, and frequently in the same building, without any recognition in the pay bill, even though a part of their salary is paid by the Federal Government.

This amendment merely provides that, as to the Federal appropriation part of their salary, it is the sense of the Congress that the Federal-appropriation portion of their salary should be increased in proportion to the increases granted to other agricultural workers in the bill.

This amendment was prepared in conference with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. We discussed adding the experiment station workers, who are in the same category except that they do not work at the county level. A part of their salary is paid by the State and a part by the Federal Government.

As I have already stated, this amendment is sponsored also by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, not only am I supporting the amendment, but, if it should develop that the Senate

should decide to separate these measures and act upon them separately, I shall support the amendment at the time it is offered to the other bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the sentiments of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. What the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has just stated is a matter of fact. Extension workers have not been considered in connection with salary increases in the past, and it is for that reason that the distinguished Senator is bringing the subject to the attention of this body, in order that it may be justly and properly considered along with provisions relating to pay increases for classified workers.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Minnesota is correct, except to this extent: The Appropriations Committee now has the authority, in acting on appropriation bills, to take into consideration whether or not any of the money shall go for the salaries of extension workers and experiment station workers. This amendment is not mandatory, of course, upon the Appropriations Committee, but is a statement of the sense of the Congress, that in adjusting those appropriations—and they are adjustable—the committee should take into consideration the amount of increase which is granted to the other workers.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I realize what the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is attempting to do. I am sympathetic toward the objective. I am one of perhaps not more than two Members of this body who were formerly in agricultural extension work.

As I say, I am sympathetic toward what the Senator is attempting to do. I do not know that it makes much difference in connection with the pending bill, because it is certainly a mixed-up mess as it stands today. However, the Senator is on unsound ground and is following an unsound procedure when he attempts to bind future appropriations committees in years to come as to what they should do. While I am entirely sympathetic toward the objective, it would be much sounder if the distinguished Senator, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, would permit us to deal with that problem when it arises.

Although sympathizing with the objective of the Senator, I believe the approach is absolutely wrong.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that this matter has come up every year in the Committee on Appropriations. There has been, so far, no definite and distinct guide to follow. There are, frequently, differences of opinion within the committee, and also differences between the two Houses. The net result has been that these workers, in my opinion, have been discriminated against. There is an important factor of morale involved in this subject.

If Congress would express itself as being the sense of Congress that in the Appropriations Committees, in passing on these matters, adjustments should be made in proportion to the increases which are given to other agricultural workers, I believe it would be a great help to the Appropriations Committee. It is not mandatory.

These matters vary from State to State. The money which is appropriated does not always have to be used for salaries, and the Appropriations Committee can look into it as to each State. However, unless there is some definite guide established, the net result will be that these workers will be neglected.

I do not see on the floor the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I discussed it with him and I have gone over it with him. I wish he were here to say a word. He is not opposing the amendment, but he did reserve the right to work the matter out in the Appropriations Committee, which is very sound and proper.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it should be worked out in the Committee on Appropriations, not on the floor of the Senate. I sympathize with what the Senator is attempting to do, but this is not the proper place to do it.

I wish to say again that the pending bill is a mixed-up bill; indeed, I have never seen a bill that has been more mixed up than the pending bill.

Mr. STENNIS. If the Senator would let me address a question to him, I should like to do so. He certainly is well prepared to discuss the subject from the standpoint of the merits of the subject of the pay of the extension workers and experiment-station workers, and he is also a former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and a very active member of it. If it is merely a matter of general principle and policy to which the Senator agrees, and agrees that it is generally sound, could he not join in the adoption of the amendment, with the final disposition of the matter to be worked out in the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will not fight it. I merely say this is not the proper way in which to proceed. I think the matter should be handled in a different way. We are going far afield by legislating in this way. I know how sincere the Senator is, and I know his objective is proper.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I should like to make one further point. There is such a variation from State to State as to how these workers are paid that it is frequently very difficult for the Committee on Appropriations to apply an across-the-board rule which would be fair to all of them. In the confusion and discrepancies that exist, frequently the problem is left unsolved. In some States the workers are paid very well indeed—indeed, at levels comparable and favorable to the pay of other agricultural workers. In other States they are not. For years and years there has been an effort to level off. I believe the amendment, with the Appropriations Committee still having full au-

thority to make the final decision, will furnish a guideline which will be helpful and will bring the matter up to a better level, and also enable Congress to deal better with the different States. There is no doubt in my mind that this is an affirmative and constructive measure which will work for the benefit of all such workers. The Appropriations Committee can make certain that no State will reduce its appropriation because of any increase which might come from Congress. Therefore, I think it is sound, and I offer the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I understand from his remarks that the junior Senator from Oregon, who has taken a leading part in the debate, on the pending bill, joins with the senior Senator from Kansas in opposing the amendment which would attach the classified employees bill to the postal pay raise and pay-rate bill. I am not clear whether the Senator's objections are based upon the premise that it is not germane, or that the classified pay bill has not been sufficiently considered, or whether it would affect adversely the passage of the postal pay rate and pay-raise bill. Would the Senator care to elucidate his reasons for opposing the attachment of the classified pay bill to the postal pay raise-postal pay rate bill?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to say, so far as my remarks in the Senate are concerned, that I have not discussed—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have order?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not blame the Senator from Kentucky for not being able to hear—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order. We cannot hear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will resume their seats.

Mr. COOPER. I have been much impressed by the Senator's argument of the junior Senator from Oregon during the debate. I have also followed very closely the argument of the senior Senator from Kansas. I wish to hear the reasons of the junior Senator from Oregon for opposing the attachment of the amendment to the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have not discussed the attaching of the classified pay bill as an amendment to the pending bill. I do not criticize the Senator from Kentucky for not being able to hear me. I have read in books that elephants have the most acute sense of hearing of any animals. However, I do not believe that even the most robust elephant that ever trod the African veldt could hear anything accurately on the floor of the Senate in view of the turmoil and confusion which have prevailed here today.

What I did discuss today was this: I wished to announce for the Record that had we had a recorded vote, instead of the voice vote, on adding the postal pay bill to the postal rate bill, I would not have voted to do that.

After the Senate adopted the Long amendment, which I regard as highly unwise, and as throwing completely out of kilter the whole basic and essential and fundamental purpose of doing justice to postal employees in the lower

brackets, I became convinced that the bill is now in an adverse and unwise form. Therefore all that I have commented on so far has been the adding of the postal pay bill to the postal rate bill.

So far as the classified pay bill is concerned, it seems to me that enough damage has already been done on the floor of the Senate tonight, and that if we add the classified pay bill to the rate-pay bill structure, hastily conceived and loosely drawn as the existing bill with the Long amendment is now, it will merely add insult to injury.

The Long amendment, it seems to me, totally throws out of all proportion what we were trying to do in the weeks and weeks of hearings on the postal pay bill. I wish that someone who voted in favor of the Long amendment would move to reconsider the vote, so that we will have an adequate bill. Otherwise we will have the most confused result that anyone can possibly imagine.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. That is the answer I expected him to make. I am glad he made it. I understood throughout the debate that the bonus proposed for the postal workers in the lower brackets was to bring some balance between the pay of those in the lower classifications and the pay of those in the higher classifications. I was very much surprised when the vote came to find out that our leaders who had argued throughout the debate against the bonus were supporting the Long amendment. Therefore, I hope that some Senator who voted for the amendment will move to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted. I am glad the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon has made clear his opinion on this point.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the junior Senator from Oregon has made a very persuasive, clear argument in support of the position he has taken. I think some of us find ourselves in the position of not wanting to discriminate against the supervisory employees of the post office. However, as one who, on the yea-and-nay vote, voted for the Long amendment, I think it should be possible to work out a procedure whereby a commitment could be made on the part of the committee and the leadership to proceed forthwith to hold hearings on the supervisory employee problem, if there is a reconsideration of the vote by which the Long amendment was agreed to, so that proposed legislation on this matter can be acted upon at a very early time.

I am opposed to combining the postal rate bill and the postal pay bill, and I think we may do much worse by combining the postal rate and the postal pay bills with the pay bill for classified Government workers.

So I suggest to the leadership that perhaps we might have a quorum call to enable us to have at least a few minutes for consultation, to the end that we might determine whether a commitment can be obtained which will satisfy the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] that if the vote by which his amendment was agreed to shall be reconsidered, hearings will be held forthwith upon his proposal. Then perhaps

a recommendation concerning supervisory employees can be made ready by the time the classified pay bill is taken up.

My hunch is that that the Senate will never agree to an amendment which will attach the classified pay bill to the postal rate and postal pay bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have followed very closely the arguments which have been made by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and the distinguished senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I supported the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas, which would have given a 8½ percent raise to all postal employees across the board.

The senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] in proposing to the senior Senator from Kansas that the 8½ percent raise be made retroactive, effective January 1, 1958, added much to the equity of the bill.

I wish to repeat that after their arguments against the bonus provision, and statements that the bonus could then be applied logically to the classified pay bill, although the purpose of the bonus in the committee amendment was to bring into balance the lower rate with the higher classification, all of which with other Members I supported. I was much surprised, I must say, when the leadership and those who had charge of the bill, then voted for the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] which extended the bonus to all classifications.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has yielded the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the pending amendment is the Stennis amendment, and I think it should be disposed of in an orderly way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have been trying to get recognition for the last 2 or 3 minutes. I think a procedure has been worked out which might be agreeable to most Senators.

Since the Senate agreed to the Long amendment on the theory that it might give more equitable treatment to certain workers, the feeling has grown that the cost of the bill might reach such a point that perhaps many Senators would want to recommit the bill.

I have talked to the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who was not present at the time the Johnston amendment was agreed to. He has agreed to move to reconsider the vote by which the Johnston amendment was agreed to.

If that motion should prevail, then the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who supported the Long amendment, would be eligible to move to reconsider the vote by which the Long amendment was agreed to.

If that motion should prevail, and the Long amendment should be rejected,

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2739

then the Senate could pass the rate bill with the Johnston pay amendment included.

Then the classified pay bill could be called up on motion separately, and the additional \$240 would not be involved in it, because the classified pay bill would not have been added to the postal bill. So the question of equality would not enter into the picture.

If that procedure appeals to the Senate, I think it would be responsible procedure.

I have an agreement with ranking members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to set a hearing in the early part of next week—Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday—and to call all witnesses who may desire to testify concerning the proposal offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and my colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. The committee then could take action on that proposal one way or the other. I think that would be more orderly procedure. If that could be done, the postal rate and pay bill could be passed today.

Then the Senate could proceed to take up the classified pay bill and perhaps pass it without any amendments.

If the Senator from South Carolina would agree to withdraw the pending classified pay bill amendment, which he has offered, he would, in so doing, withdraw the Stennis amendment with it. Then the motion of the Senator from Florida would be in order.

If it were agreed to, the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would be in order. If it were agreed to, the motion to reconsider the Long amendment would be in order. Then the motion to restore the Johnston amendment would be in order, and the bill could be passed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I think the majority leader has worked out a satisfactory schedule of events which must take place in order to get this program back on schedule. I support it 100 percent, and I sincerely hope the Senate will do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the suggestion made by the majority leader will give the Senate an opportunity to act on this question again, without making the classified pay bill a part of the postal rate and pay bill. This will enable the Senate to exercise its will on the matter of reconsideration concerning the Long amendment, and then to discuss the matter on its merits, if it has any. But preferably, to follow the suggestion made by the majority leader, that the matter be taken up separately before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, would enable the Senate to pass the postal rate and pay bill tonight, and then to act separately on the classified pay bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think the Stennis amendment is extremely bad. It asks Congress to memorialize itself. What it proposes is to have

the Senate memorialize the Committee on Appropriations to provide more money. If more money is needed, let those who want it appear before the Committee on Appropriations. Anyone can appear.

I understand the amendment will be rejected if the procedure outlined by the majority leader shall be adopted. For that reason, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for the purpose of withdrawing his amendment, if he desires to do so.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I agree with everything the majority leader has said. It will be remembered that it was several weeks ago when it was agreed to combine the bills.

For the information of the Senate, the House has passed bills on this subject, and they are on the floor at the present time, I understand. If we send this bill to the House, the House can send the Senate bill to conference. We are in a different situation at this time.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment, so that the matters can be considered separately.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, can an amendment which has been agreed to be withdrawn?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not been agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Johnston amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to that motion for a moment or two. A principle is involved which has always had some meaning to the junior Senator from Louisiana. It is that we ought to try to treat all Federal employees alike. I feel we should treat all of them fairly whether they happen to be high-paid or low-paid employees.

If there is to be a pay increase because of the increase in the cost of living, it seems to me we should take steps to see to it that that increase is made available to those with incomes of \$5,000 to \$10,000, as well as to those with incomes of only \$3,000 or \$4,000. If a pay raise is to be made, it seems to me that the employees in the classified service should be considered, as well as the employees who happen to be in the postal service.

Mr. President, in this instance, what are we told? In the first place, we have not heard on the floor of the Senate any argument as to why the Long-Yarborough amendment should be rejected.

I asked that the name of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] be added as a cosponsor of the amendment, because he originated it.

Here we have the principle that if we undertake to raise the pay of some of the Government employees, we should take steps to see to it that all of the Government employees are treated alike. The Senate agreed to do that; that is what the action taken by the Senate amounted to.

Subsequently, in arguments made from place to place—but certainly not

made here on the floor of the Senate—it was said or whispered that a mistake had been made, and that therefore the vote by which the amendment was agreed to should be reconsidered.

I understand that it has been argued that the principle of treating the supervisors in the same way that the employees in the lower brackets are to be treated should not be applied to the employees in the classified service; I understand that it was argued that to apply the same principle to the employees in the classified service would perhaps cost a great deal of money.

Of course, Mr. President, I am one who believes that what is right is right; that if something is right for a postal worker, it is also right for a classified worker.

All of these provisions will be in conference. If Senators do not wish to vote to have the classified workers receive as much of a pay raise as the postal workers are to receive, Senators have a right to vote that way.

On the other hand, if the conferees submit a report which provides that the workers in the postal service shall receive a larger pay increase than that received by the workers in the classified service, I recognize that it is possible that such a report might be agreed to.

But, Mr. President, it seems to me that the principle of treating all alike is a fair one. Certainly it is one for which some of us would like to vote.

Here is the principal difference between the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and myself and the Johnston amendment without the addition of our amendment.

The Johnston amendment provides for a 7½-percent pay increase, plus a \$240 cost-of-living bonus. The 7½-percent increase would apply to all the workers. The \$240 bonus would apply only to those in the lower pay grades. If a \$240 bonus were applied straight across the board, naturally those in the lower pay brackets would receive, percentagewise, a much greater increase than would those in the upper brackets. Under those circumstances, a person in the lower pay brackets would be much happier to receive a lump-sum increase than to receive a percentage increase, whereas a person in the upper pay brackets obviously would fare better from a percentage increase than he would from a flat-cash increase.

But inasmuch as the committee has accepted the point of view of those in the lower pay brackets—namely, to include the provision for a straight-across-the-board cost of living bonus of \$240—it should also permit those above the \$5,000 bracket to receive such a bonus.

It seems to me that if the cash bonus proposal is to be accepted, we should recognize that the cost of living for those in the upper pay brackets has increased just as much as has the cost of living for those who happen to be in the lower pay brackets.

Some Senator pointed out, here on the floor, that approximately 3 years ago the Senate voted a large pay increase for the supervisors. That was done. That increase was, percentagewise,

greater than the increase which other employees received—for the simple reason that certain groups of workers had been receiving pay raises year in and year out, while others had not received any raises in pay. So that change was made in order to do away with the many injustices which had been done in the case of those who, year in and year out, had been left out and who had the responsibility of supervising in the Government. That was done on the basis of the principle that lay behind the action we took some years ago, when we voted a pay raise for the members of the President's Cabinet, who had not received a pay raise in approximately 20 years' time.

Unless we should base our action on the principle of treating all alike once again the salary schedules will be out of line, and the workers in the lower-pay brackets will receive pay increases, whereas the workers in the upper Government-pay brackets will not.

It is my estimate that the bill without our amendment will cost \$300 million. It is also my estimate that the amendment to take care of the pay raise proposed for the supervisors will cost approximately \$9 million. The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] has the cost figures in mind better than I do. Let me ask the Senator from Texas whether that is his understanding.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is correct. The estimates vary from \$270 million to \$309 million; but to take care of the pay increase for the supervisors will cost only approximately \$9 million; and that \$9 million will include raises for the second-class, and third-class postmasters.

I wish to point out that a general classified employee has many opportunities for promotion to the higher grades, whereas a third-class postmaster does not have such opportunities. Many of the postal employees do not have opportunities for promotion comparable to those enjoyed by the employees in the classified service.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question: What type of pay advancement does the able junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] think is the fairer? An across-the-board, flat increase for all the workers; or a percentage increase?

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that a percentage increase would be more equitable to all concerned. A case can be made for a lump-sum payment. Such a payment tends to favor those in the lower pay brackets.

Mind you, Mr. President, I do not object to a \$240 lump-sum payment. But since such a payment would be more favorable to those in the lower pay brackets, I see no reason for objection to omitting the supervisors entirely from such a provision.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Louisiana not think the situation is unusual, when 420,000 out of a total of 519,000 employees are in level 4, and when the top pay in level 4 is about \$4,400? Furthermore, let me point out that practically all the employees in or below level 4 are the heads of families, and have very sub-

stantial responsibilities. Under those extraordinary circumstances—because the postal structure is not duplicated elsewhere in the Government, and is not duplicated at all in private industry—does not it seem fair to include a provision for a lump-sum bonus of \$240?

Mr. LONG. How many did the Senator from Oregon say were in that group?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Four hundred and twenty thousand out of a total of five hundred and nineteen thousand.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, let me point out that in this country there happen to be 4 million aged people who are living on public welfare. They are trying to get by on anywhere from \$25 to \$65 a month. I certainly would like to do something to aid them. I certainly hope the Senator from Oregon will be prepared to help us look after the needy and the aged.

But that is not the principle in this case. The pending measure is not a public-welfare measure. It is a measure to try to reward those who are entitled to receive a pay raise and to try to offset the increase in the cost of living to which they have been subjected. Not just a few of them have been subjected to the cost-of-living increase; all of them have been subjected to it.

I submit that if a pay increase is to be given to those in the lower pay brackets, the same principle should be applied to those who are in the upper pay brackets.

If, on the other hand, we simply increase the pay of those in the lower brackets, those at the bottom of the scale, in time we shall simply find ourselves back in the old, unsatisfactory, bad situation we were in some years ago, when, as a result of increasing the pay of those in the lower brackets, but not providing a similar increase in the pay of the supervisors, we found that the Government was not receiving proper supervisory services, and the Government service was suffering.

Mr. President, I hope very much that the Senate will reject the motion to reconsider the vote by which it adopted the amendment which the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] joined me in submitting. I hope the motion will be rejected, because I am satisfied that the principle of providing for fair treatment for all the employees will be better served by means of our amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it agreed to the amendment submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want the junior Senator from Louisiana to know I think the objective he has in mind is sound. We have to face up to the situation that we are going to have a postal bill get through the Senate. We have a commitment from the majority leader; from the ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. CARLSON], and from the chairman of the committee

[Mr. JOHNSTON], that early next week hearings will be held on the very problem the Senator from Louisiana has just raised. In my opinion, procedurally that is the best way to handle the matter. It takes us out of a very difficult parliamentary situation.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the Long amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon to reconsider the vote by which the Long amendment to the Johnston amendment was agreed to.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The question recurs on the adoption of the Long amendment, does it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the Long amendment to the Johnston amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The question now is on agreeing to the Johnston amendment, as amended; is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The question is on agreeing to the Johnston amendment, as amended.

The Johnston amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Kansas has an amendment he would like to submit at this time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senator from Oklahoma and I had a colloquy about striking out lines 13 through 16 on page 48 of the bill. I asked unanimous consent that the language be stricken. When that was done, the preceding paragraph ended with a semicolon.

I move that, in lieu of the semicolon, a period appear on line 12, and that the word "and" be placed between the words "organizations" and "for," on line 9, page 48, in order to make the section read sensibly.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will say to him that in a moment I shall make a unanimous consent request that will take care of such matters.

Mr. CARLSON. I have been advised by the legislative counsel that it is necessary to take this action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the amendments of the Senate to the bill, H. R. 5836, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make all necessary clerical

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2741

and technical changes, including such changes in section, subsection, and paragraph numbers and references thereto as may be necessary to the proper numbering and lettering of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield so that I may address an inquiry to him?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To how many classes will the \$240 cost-of-living bonus be applied? Will it be applied to the first 3 classes or to the first 5 classes?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The first five classes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before we finally take action on the postal rate and postal pay bill, I should like to state I am informed that, by the action of the Senate on those combined bills up to this time, we have provided for an increase in postal revenues of approximately \$700 million annually, based on a 4- and 5-cent combination first-class rate, and the other rates put into the postal rate bill; that, in connection with the postal pay provisions, the cost of the amendments thus far adopted will be approximately \$350 million; that the estimated postal deficit, when we consider the coming year and what it has been without any rate or any pay bill, and with the passage of the postal rate bill and assuming that the postal pay provision goes through as is presently in the proposed legislation before us, will remain at approximately \$350 million.

I thought that information should be available to the Senate.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Am I not correct in understanding that the \$350 million cost of the bill as it now stands includes several million, perhaps nearly as much as \$40 million to \$50 million, on account of the retroactive feature, which will not be repeated on an annual basis?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I believe that statement is correct.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. So the annual cost will be approximately between \$300 million and \$310 million?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that is generally correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not care to provoke any arguments about it, because it is very difficult to determine which figures are accurate. I know my distinguished colleague has been using the most recent figures he has been able to obtain, but I remind him that we were told that it was going to cost \$270 million. Then we were told it was going to cost \$320 million. We have added nothing and now we are told it is going to cost \$350 million. In any event, we are in the process of passing a bill which will supply twice as much revenue as the pay raises will cost. If we do that each year, pretty soon we shall clear up the deficit of the Post Office Department.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely desired to point out, however, that the revenues I indicated are based on a 5-cent rate outside local zones, and on a 4-cent rate inside local zones. Should the 5-cent rate provision be eliminated, I understand it would result in reducing the estimated revenue by approximately \$200 million.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no thought that it will be eliminated in the Senate before we pass this bill. What the House does is a matter for that body to decide. I only hope we can take action on the bill so we can proceed to the consideration of the classified pay bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not care to associate myself with those who think a rate bill should be tied to a wage increase to which workers are justly entitled. The workers are entitled to increases whether we raise postal rates 1 cent or not. They are justly entitled to increases. It was on that basis that I voted. If some revenues are to be gained through passage of the rate bill, that is to the advantage of the Treasury Department.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Minnesota will not get me into an argument on that matter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we all will have to acknowledge that the provisions we have agreed to thus far will result in increases in rates which will amount to about \$750 million. Personally, I have never thought that we ought in any way to tie increased postal rates to increased pay for workers, whether they be in the Post Office Department or in any other department. A provision was agreed to that 15 percent ought not to be charged against the Post Office, and that is written in the bill. If that amount is deducted, it will be seen the Post Office Department has balanced its budget, and more.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. As my colleagues sitting around me can testify, I voted against the Johnston amendment, which seeks to bring together the postal-rate bill and the salary or wage bill, for the reasons I set forth in a speech earlier this week, and for the reasons I have stated in answering the many requests from my home State, from postal workers, to do exactly what the Johnston amendment calls for.

I want the Record to show that I am against that parliamentary procedure in the handling of rate and wage legislation.

I wish to say, as I have said before, that I am in favor of the postal workers getting the increase which is called for by the postal wage bill.

We are now in an accomplished fact situation, where the bill will go to conference. It will be my position from now on, having done the best I could to oppose the combining of the two bills, to support the best bill that may come out of conference.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. There are in my State the largest number of postal workers of any State in the United States. I think the end result of legislation is what counts. Those workers are entitled to justice. We have been trying to get it for them. This seems to me to be the constructive and effective way to do it. I am in favor of this proposed legislation, because it is the effective way to obtain for those workers a raise in pay, instead of just talking about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the reason I asked for the yeas and nays, which have been refused, is, as I mentioned a few moments ago, some of us have been voting "yea" as to some amendments and "nay" as to some amendments. I asked for the yeas and nays so that I could be recorded as in favor of passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 5836) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the title of the bill will be appropriately amended.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to establish a postal policy, to adjust postal rates, to adjust the compensation of postal employees, and for other purposes."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Kansas to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PAY ACT OF 1958

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 740, S. 734.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 734) to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to proceed to consider the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 734) to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of

1949, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and subsequently with an additional amendment, in lieu of the committee substitute for the bill, to insert the following:

That this act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Pay Act of 1958."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 603 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1113 (b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the general schedule shall be as follows:

Grade	Per annum rates						
	\$2,890	\$2,980	\$3,070	\$3,160	\$3,250	\$3,340	\$3,430
GS-1	3,180	3,270	3,360	3,450	3,540	3,630	3,720
GS-2	3,415	3,505	3,595	3,685	3,775	3,865	3,955
GS-3	3,670	3,760	3,850	3,940	4,030	4,120	4,210
GS-4	3,945	4,090	4,235	4,380	4,525	4,670	4,815
GS-5	4,385	4,530	4,675	4,820	4,965	5,110	5,255
GS-6	4,865	5,010	5,155	5,300	5,445	5,590	5,735
GS-7	5,345	5,490	5,635	5,780	5,925	6,070	6,215
GS-8	5,850	5,995	6,140	6,285	6,430	6,575	6,720
GS-9	6,360	6,505	6,650	6,795	6,940	7,085	7,230
GS-10	6,870	7,100	7,330	7,560	7,790	8,020	
GS-11	8,140	8,370	8,600	8,830	9,060	9,290	
GS-12	9,750	10,000	10,250	10,500	10,750	11,000	
GS-13	11,250	11,500	11,750	12,000	12,250	12,500	
GS-14	12,600	12,900	13,200	13,500	13,800		
GS-15	14,000	14,300	14,600	14,900	15,200		
GS-16	15,500	15,800	16,100	16,400	16,700		
GS-17							
GS-18							

(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be adjusted as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates of a grade in the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date.

(2) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between 2 scheduled or 2 longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the General Schedule, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate he received immediately prior to such effective date increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the next lower scheduled rate of his grade.

(3) If the officer or employee (other than an officer or employee subject to paragraph (4) of this subsection), immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, he shall receive basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he received immediately prior to such effective date, increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate, or the maximum scheduled rate, as the case may be, of his grade until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but, when his position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended.

(4) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is receiving, pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 2 (b) of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under section 208 (b) of the act of September 1, 1954 (68 Stat. 1111; Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), plus the amount of the increase

provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, he shall receive an aggregate rate of compensation equal to the sum of (A) his existing aggregate rate of compensation determined under such section 208 (b) of the act of September 1, 1954, and (B) the amount of the increase provided by section 2 of the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, and (C) the amount of the increase made by this section in the maximum longevity rate of his grade, until (i) he leaves his position, or (ii) he is entitled to receive aggregate compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this act or any other provision of law; but, when such position becomes vacant, the aggregate rate of compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with applicable provisions of law. Subject to clauses (i) and (ii) of the immediately preceding sentence of this paragraph, the amount of the increase provided by this section shall be held and considered for the purposes of section 208 (b) of such act of September 1, 1954, to constitute a part of the existing aggregate rate of compensation of such employee.

(5) If the officer or employee, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this act, was promoted from one grade under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to another such grade at a rate which is above the minimum rate thereof, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively from the effective date of this section to the date on which he was so promoted, on the basis of the rate which he was receiving during the period from such effective date to the date of such promotion and, from the date of such promotion, on the basis of the rate for that step of the appropriate grade of the general schedule contained in this section which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the general schedule for such officer or employee which was in effect (without regard to this act) at the time of such promotion.

(6) Except as provided in paragraph (7) of this subsection, if the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the date of enactment of this act as a result of action taken under section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C. 1133), he shall re-

ceive the higher of either (A) a rate of basic compensation at the scheduled rate in effect on the effective date of this section to which he would have been entitled under the provisions of section 701 of the Classification Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 1121) had such action under section 803 not been taken, or (B) a rate of basic compensation at the scheduled rate in effect on such effective date which is equal to his existing rate, or if there is no such scheduled rate equal to his existing rate, then at the next higher scheduled rate; *Provided*, That upon approval by the Civil Service Commission, based upon a determination that such action is equitable, any such employee may be paid at any scheduled rate not in excess of the rate which he was receiving on the date of enactment of this act, adjusted in accordance with paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection.

(7) If the officer or employee has had his rate of basic compensation adjusted, under authority of section 803 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (68 Stat. 1106; 5 U. S. C. 1133), at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this act and ending on the date of enactment of this act—

(A) his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively in accordance with the initial conversion rules prescribed in paragraph (1), (2), and (3) of this subsection for the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the effective date of such adjustment under such section 803, on the basis of the rate or rates which he was receiving during such period; and

(B) on and after the effective date of such adjustment under such section 803, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation adjusted in accordance with paragraph (6) of this subsection.

(8) If the officer or employee, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this act, became subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, at a rate of basic compensation which was fixed on the basis of a higher previously earned rate and which is above the minimum rate of the grade of such officer or employee, his rate of basic compensation shall be adjusted retroactively to the date on which he became subject to such act, on the basis of the rate for that step of the appropriate grade of the general schedule contained in this section which corresponds numerically to the step of the grade of the general schedule for such officer or employee which was in effect (without regard to this act) at the time he became subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(9) Each officer or employee—

(A) (i) who with his position has been transferred under authority of the Classification Act of 1949, at any time during the period beginning on the effective date of this section and ending on the date of enactment of this act, from the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 to a prevailing rate schedule, or (ii) who, at any time during such period, transferred from a position subject to the Classification Act of 1949 to a position subject to a prevailing rate schedule,

(B) who, at all times subsequent to such transfer, was in the service of the United States (including the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, without break in such service of more than 30 consecutive calendar days and, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, without break in service in excess of the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2743

the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia,

(C) who, on such date of enactment, is being compensated under a prevailing rate schedule, and

(D) whose rate of basic compensation on such date of enactment is less than the rate to which he would have been entitled on such date if such transfer had not occurred (unless he is receiving such lesser rate by reason of an adverse personnel action resulting from his own fault), shall be paid basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he would have been receiving on such date of enactment (including compensation for each within-grade and longevity step-increase which he would have earned) if such transfer had not occurred until the day immediately following such date of enactment, for all time in a pay status on and after the effective date of this section in a position subject to a prevailing rate schedule under the circumstances prescribed in this subsection, until—

(a) he leaves the position which he holds on such date of enactment, or

(b) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate under a prevailing rate schedule; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with prevailing rate schedules.

SEC. 3. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision a of section 62 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C., sec. 102 (a), (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the third sentence of section 603, section 604 (a) (5), or section 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code are hereby increased by amounts equal to the increases provided by section 2 of this act in corresponding rates of compensation paid to officers and employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The limitations of \$13,485 and \$18,010 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges contained in the paragraph under the heading "Salaries of Supporting Personnel" in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1958, or in any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this act.

(c) Section 753 (e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out "\$6,450" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$6,935".

SEC. 4. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 7.5 percent of his gross rate of compensation (basic compensation plus additional compensation authorized by law).

(b) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator is hereby adjusted, effective on the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act, to the lowest multiple of \$60 which will provide a gross rate of compensation not less than the gross rate such employee was receiving immediately prior thereto, except that (1) the provisions of this subsection shall not apply in the case of any employee if on or before the 15th day following the date of enactment of this act the Senator by whom such employee is employed notifies the disbursing office of the Senate in writing that he does not wish this subsection to apply to such employee, and (2) no increase in compensation shall result from such adjustment in basic com-

pensation for any period prior to the date thereof.

(c) Notwithstanding the provision referred to in subsection (d), the rates of gross compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the Legislative Counsel and senior counsel in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives, the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives, and the Chief Clerk of the Senate are hereby increased by 7.5 percent.

(d) The paragraph imposing limitations on basic and gross compensation of officers and employees of the Senate appearing under the heading "Senate" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, is amended to read as follows:

"No officer of employee, whose compensation is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate shall be paid basic compensation at a rate in excess of \$8,880 per annum, or gross compensation, at a rate in excess of \$16,000 per annum, unless expressly authorized by law."

(e) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in the paragraph designated "Folding documents" under the heading "Contingent Expenses of the Senate" in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1958, or in any subsequent appropriation act, but the limitations contained in such paragraph are hereby increased by the amounts necessary to provide increases corresponding to those provided by subsection (a).

(f) The official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees shall be considered to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government within the meaning of subsection (a).

(g) The additional compensation provided by subsection (a) shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

(h) The paragraph relating to rates of compensation of employees of committees of the Senate, contained in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1956, is amended by striking out so much of the second sentence thereof as follows the words "First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the basic compensation of any employee of a standing or select committee of the Senate (including the majority and minority policy committees and the majority conference of the Senate and the minority conference of the Senate), or a joint committee of the two Houses the expenses of which are paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, whose basic compensation may be fixed under such provisions at a rate of \$8,000 per annum, may be fixed at a rate not in excess of \$8,040 per annum, except that the basic compensation of one such employee may be fixed at a rate not in excess of \$8,880 per annum and the basic compensation of two such employees may be fixed at a rate not in excess of \$8,460 per annum."

(i) No officer or employee shall be paid increased or additional compensation for any period prior to the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act at a rate in excess of 7.5 percent of his gross rate of compensation computed without regard to the amendment made by subsection (d).

(j) The position of chief nurse in the Senate Office Building, under the office of the Architect of the Capital, shall be established and allocated to grade 9 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of

1949, as amended, so long as such position is held by the present incumbent.

SEC. 5. (a) The last sentence of section 1403 (d) of the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 130; Public Law 85-56), relating to the annual salaries of the directors of service or chiefs or division of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration is amended by striking out "\$13,225 minimum to \$14,300 maximum" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$14,300 minimum to \$15,200 maximum."

(b) Section 1403 (e) of such act, relating to the annual salaries of the Director of Nursing Service and the Deputy Director of Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$11,610" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$12,600"; and

(2) by striking out "\$10,320" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$11,250."

(c) Section 1403 (f) of such act, relating to the annual salaries of the chief pharmacist, the chief dietitian, the chief physical therapist, and the chief occupational therapist of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out "\$10,320" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$11,250."

(d) Section 1407 (a) of such act, relating to maximum and minimum annual rates of salary of certain employees of the Medical Service, Dental Service, and Nursing Service of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The grades and per annum full-pay ranges for positions provided in paragraph (1) of section 1404 shall be as follows:

"MEDICAL SERVICE

"Chief grade, \$12,600 minimum to \$13,800 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$11,250 minimum to \$12,500 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$9,750 minimum to \$11,000 maximum.

"Full grade, \$8,140 minimum to \$9,290 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$6,870 minimum to \$8,020 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$6,360 minimum to \$7,230 maximum.

"DENTAL SERVICE

"Chief grade, \$12,600 minimum to \$13,800 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$11,250 minimum to \$12,500 maximum.

"Intermediate grade, \$9,750 minimum to \$11,000 maximum.

"Full grade, \$8,140 minimum to \$9,290 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$6,870 minimum to \$8,020 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$6,360 minimum to \$7,230 maximum.

"NURSING SERVICE

"Assistant Director, \$8,140 minimum to \$9,290 maximum.

"Senior grade, \$6,870 minimum to \$8,020 maximum.

"Full grade, \$5,850 minimum to \$6,720 maximum.

"Associate grade, \$5,085 minimum to \$6,010 maximum.

"Junior grade, \$4,330 minimum to \$5,250 maximum."

(e) Section 1408 (d) of such act, prescribing the maximum amount of pay and allowances of medical, surgical, and dental specialists of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration, is amended by striking out "\$13,760" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$15,200".

SEC. 6. The Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) The schedule contained in section 412 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Class 1.....	\$16,060	\$16,500	\$16,940	\$17,380	\$17,500		
Class 2.....	13,860	14,190	14,520	14,850	15,180	\$15,510	\$15,840
Class 3.....	11,550	11,880	12,210	12,540	12,870	13,200	13,530
Class 4.....	9,765	10,040	10,315	10,590	10,865	11,140	11,415
Class 5.....	7,955	8,225	8,495	8,765	9,035	9,305	9,575
Class 6.....	6,560	6,775	6,990	7,205	7,420	7,635	7,850
Class 7.....	5,485	5,645	5,805	5,965	6,125	6,285	6,445
Class 8.....	4,625	4,785	4,945	5,105	5,265	5,425	5,585
							\$5,745"

(b) Section 415 of such act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 415. There shall be 22 classes of Foreign Service staff officers and employees, re-

ferred to hereafter as staff officers and employees. The per annum rates of salary of staff officers and employees within each class shall be as follows:

"Class 1.....	\$11,770	\$12,120	\$12,470	\$12,820	\$13,170		
Class 2.....	10,815	11,115	11,415	11,715	12,015		
Class 3.....	9,895	10,175	10,455	10,735	11,015		
Class 4.....	8,890	9,165	9,440	9,715	9,990		
Class 5.....	8,200	8,435	8,670	8,905	9,140	\$9,375	
Class 6.....	7,515	7,725	7,935	8,145	8,355	8,565	
Class 7.....	6,830	7,035	7,240	7,445	7,650	7,855	
Class 8.....	6,145	6,350	6,555	6,760	6,965	7,170	
Class 9.....	5,455	5,660	5,865	6,070	6,275	6,480	
Class 10.....	5,000	5,175	5,350	5,525	5,700	5,875	\$6,050
Class 11.....	4,540	4,680	4,820	4,960	5,100	5,240	5,380
Class 12.....	4,085	4,225	4,365	4,505	4,645	4,785	4,925
Class 13.....	3,645	3,785	3,925	4,065	4,205	4,345	4,485
Class 14.....	3,225	3,365	3,505	3,645	3,785	3,925	4,065
Class 15.....	3,020	3,125	3,230	3,335	3,440	3,545	3,650
Class 16.....	2,810	2,880	2,950	3,020	3,090	3,160	3,230
Class 17.....	2,600	2,670	2,740	2,810	2,880	2,950	3,020
Class 18.....	2,395	2,465	2,535	2,605	2,675	2,745	2,815
Class 19.....	2,190	2,260	2,330	2,400	2,470	2,540	2,610
Class 20.....	1,980	2,050	2,120	2,190	2,260	2,330	2,400
Class 21.....	1,770	1,840	1,910	1,980	2,050	2,120	2,190
Class 22.....	1,565	1,635	1,705	1,775	1,845	1,915	1,985"

SEC. 7. Section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1105), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) The Administrator of the United States Courts is authorized to place a total of four positions in grade 17 of the General Schedule. Such positions shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade by subsection (b)."

SEC. 8. Section 505 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "twelve hundred and twenty-six" and inserting "eighteen hundred", by striking out "three hundred and twenty-nine" and inserting "four hundred and seventy-five", and by striking out "one hundred and thirty" and inserting "one hundred and ninety".

SEC. 9. (a) The first section of the act of August 1, 1947 (Public Law 313, 80th Cong.), as amended is amended by striking out "one hundred and twenty" and "twenty-five" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "four hundred and fifty" and "fifty", respectively.

(b) Such section is further amended by striking out "thirty" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "one hundred and fifty".

(c) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 10 scientific or professional positions in the Department of the Interior, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than five scientific or professional positions in the Department of Agriculture, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(f) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than five scientific or professional positions in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel.

"(g) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to establish and fix the compensation for not more than 50 scientific or professional positions in the Department of Commerce, each such position being established to effectuate those research and development functions of such Department which require the services of specially qualified personnel."

(d) Section 3 of such act is amended by inserting after "Secretary of Defense" a comma and the following: "the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare," and by inserting after "Military Establishment" a comma and the following: "the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

SEC. 10. The Chief and the Assistant Chief of the Training and Standards Branch of the National Institute of Mental Health shall be paid basic compensation at the rate of \$17,500 per annum, except that if the person holding either such office is subject to the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, such person shall be paid such compensation as, when added to his pay and allowances under such act, will cause his total compensation to be at the rate of \$17,500 per annum.

SEC. 11. Except as provided in sections 4 (c) and 9, (1) no rate of compensation or salary which is \$17,500 or more per annum shall be increased by reason of this act, and (2) no rate of compensation or salary shall be increased by reason of this act to an amount in excess of \$17,500 per annum.

SEC. 12. (a) During the calendar quarter beginning on April 1, 1958, no appointment may be made to any civilian office or position in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) During any calendar quarter beginning after July 1, 1958, the total number of appointments made to civilian officers and positions in the executive branch of the Government shall not exceed a number equal to one-third of the vacancies which occurred in such offices and positions during the preceding calendar quarter.

(c) As used in this section, the terms "office" and "position" shall not include—

(1) any office or position required to be filled by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(2) a postmaster of the fourth class;

(3) any office or position filled from within the department or agency;

(4) any office or position held by an officer or employee paid wholly from a trust fund, or a fund derived from a trust account;

(5) any office or position held by an employee employed without compensation;

(6) any position held by a seasonal or casual worker;

(7) any office or position the filling of which is determined by the President to be necessary to the effective administration, execution, and operation of the national health, security, welfare, and management functions and activities of the Government;

(8) any office or position filled by any person in the exercise of reemployment rights under section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act or any other provision of law conferring reemployment rights upon persons who have performed active duty in the Armed Forces, or by any person required to be restored to an office or position pursuant to an order of the Civil Service Commission or of any court; and

(9) any office or position in the General Accounting Office.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply during any calendar quarter if at the end of the preceding calendar quarter the aggregate number of full-time civilian officers and employees (including the full-time equivalent of part-time employment but excluding employees holding positions referred to in subsection (c) (4), (5), and (6)) does not exceed 2,150,000 or such other figure as may be established from time to time by Executive order of the President.

(e) The President may authorize the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(f) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall not be construed to prohibit any appointment which is made pursuant to a commitment made prior to the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 13. (a) (1) Clause (2) of that paragraph of section 602 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1112), which defines the level of difficulty and responsibility of work in grade 5 of the general schedule (GS-5) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to perform, under immediate supervision, and with little opportunity for the exercise of independent judgment, simple and elementary work requiring professional, scientific, or technical training; or"

(2) Clause (2) of that paragraph of the same section which defines the level of difficulty and responsibility of work in grade 7 of the general schedule (GS-7) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) under immediate or general supervision, to perform somewhat difficult work requiring (A) professional, scientific, or technical training, and (B) to a limited extent, the exercise of independent technical judgment; or"

(b) The Civil Service Commission shall exercise its authority to issue such standards or regulations as may be necessary for the administration of subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 14. (a) Notwithstanding section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665), the rates of compensation of officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law and are not otherwise increased by this act are hereby authorized to be increased, effective on or after the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1957, by amounts not to exceed the increases provided by this act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(b) Any appropriation required to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the

Revised Statutes, as amended, may be apportioned on a basis indicating the need for a supplemental or deficiency estimate of appropriation to the extent necessary to permit payment of such increases as may be granted officers and employees of the Federal Government and of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rates of compensation are fixed by administrative action pursuant to law, but only to the extent that such increases do not exceed the increases provided by this act for corresponding rates of compensation in the appropriate schedule or scale of pay.

(c) Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize any increase in the rates of compensation of officers and employees whose rates of compensation are fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates or practices.

SEC. 15. (a) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid by reason of this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid (1) to an officer or employee who retired during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1957, and ending on the date of enactment of this act for services rendered during such period and (2) in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Cong.), as amended, for services rendered during the period beginning on the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1957, and ending on the date of enactment of this act by an officer or employee who dies during such period.

(b) For the purposes of this section, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 16. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, this act shall take effect as of the first day of the first pay period which began on or after October 1, 1957.

(b) This section, the first section, and sections 4 (b), 4 (e), 4 (h), 4 (j), 10, 14, and 15 shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

(c) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, all changes in rates of compensation or salary which result from the enactment of this act shall be held and considered to be effective as of the date of such enactment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has the motion been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion has been agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] give an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendment in lieu of the committee substitute for the bill be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title will be read by the clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 734) to revise the basic compensation schedules of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is that the star print of this year?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May we have order in the Chamber, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that the star print of the committee amendment be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this is a very simple bill, in that it provides a 7½-percent increase across the board. Since we have passed the other bill, to provide a pay increase for the postal workers, I do not see any reason whatsoever for not passing this bill immediately and sending it to the House. The House has under consideration a similar bill which has been reported.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from South Carolina is going to offer an amendment to the classified-pay bill to change the effective date from October to January. Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the only change.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it in order that such an amendment be offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the amendment is in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the clerk read the amendment which the Senator has at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out "October 1, 1957" wherever it appears and insert in lieu thereof "January 1, 1958."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from South Carolina has some perfecting amendments to offer.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk a perfecting amendment to the committee amendment. The amendment corrects a number of typographical or printing errors in the committee amendment. Also, it adjusts the number of additional jobs allocated to the Department

of Defense to take into account an authorization in an appropriation bill and makes provision for future adjustments in similar situations.

I ask that these perfecting changes be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "a new subsection as follows", and insert in lieu thereof "the following new subsections."

On page 17, line 15, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 17, between lines 15 and 16 insert the following:

(g) In any case in which, subsequent to February 1, 1958, provisions are included in a general appropriation act authorizing an agency of the Government to place additional positions in grade 16, 17, or 18, the total number of positions authorized by this section to be placed in such grades shall, unless otherwise expressly provided, be deemed to have been reduced by the number of positions authorized by such provisions to be placed in such grades.

On page 18, line 2, strike out "eighteen hundred" and insert "seventeen hundred and ninety".

On page 18, line 4, strike out "four hundred and seventy-five" and insert "four hundred and seventy-two".

On page 18, lines 5 and 6, strike out "one hundred and ninety" and insert "one hundred and eighty-eight."

On page 18, line 11, strike out "four hundred and fifty" and insert "four hundred and thirty-five."

On page 19, line 18, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 19, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(h) In any case in which, subsequent to February 1, 1958, provisions are included in a general appropriation act authorizing an agency of the Government referred to in this act to establish and fix the compensation of scientific or professional positions similar to those authorized by this act, the number of such positions authorized by this act shall, unless otherwise expressly provided, be deemed to have been reduced by the number of positions authorized by the provisions of such appropriation act.

On page 20, line 23, strike out "July 1" and insert "June 30."

On page 21, between lines 22 and 23, insert a new paragraph as follows:

(8) any office or position in a Department, agency, or other organizational unit if the President determines that the application of this section to such Department, agency, or unit, is not in the public interest;

On page 21, line 23, strike out "(8)" and insert "(9)."

On page 22, line 6, strike out "(9)" and insert "(10)."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that the Senator has stated these changes constitute simply perfecting amendments to the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Perfecting amendments, in that we have considered amendments this year to the bill of last year, which we introduced.

We had to go through the bill to correct it. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], I am sure, will confirm that statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Have these amendments been approved by the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They have been approved by the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. They were approved, and the Senator is merely requesting that the bill be perfected?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I refer to the bill which was reported last year. The committee adopted some amendments this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina that the amendments be considered en bloc? The Chair hears none, and without objection the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, after line 6, of the additional amendment to S. 734 it is proposed to insert a new paragraph as subsection (b) of section 8 as follows:

(b) Such section is further amended by striking out "thirty-seven" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "seventy-five."

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I discussed this amendment earlier. It will provide an increase in the salaries of a number of top-grade employees in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the amendment is acceptable to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CARLSON. I have discussed the amendment with the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I move that Section 10, beginning with line 15, on page 29 and including all of page 30 down through line 22 on page 31 be stricken from the bill.

The amendment under consideration, offered by the Senator from South Carolina will limit the number of persons who can be employed by the Federal Government to 2,150,000. I am in favor and I think every other Senator is in favor of reducing the number of personnel, but this provision would make operations difficult. The chairman of the committee has agreed to accept the

amendment, and I hope we can take care of the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat his amendment? Did I understand the Senator to begin on page 29 at line 10?

Mr. CARLSON. My amendment is to strike out the entire section 10.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On what page of the bill is that?

Mr. CARLSON. Page 29.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be excused from further attendance of the Senate today.

Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I am in favor of the pending bill, now being debated by the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is some confusion about the proposed amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There are two committee amendments, Mr. President.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if the majority leader will permit me to make a statement, I had before me the wrong amendment. I had in mind the same section, but in the new amendment it is Section 12. I move that Section 12 be deleted from the additional amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator moves to eliminate Section 12 from the additional amendment, now under consideration. Will the clerk state the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 19, it is proposed to strike out Section 12, beginning with line 19 on page 20, down to and including line 24 on page 22.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the motion of the Senator from Kansas is to strike all of section 12, which begins at line 19 of page 20 and runs through line 24 on page 22?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am advised that that is the same language which is carried in the other amendment, and that is the language to which my amendment refers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the purpose of the amendment is to remove the limitation on the number of employees the Federal Government may have.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The present limitation is 2,150,000.

Mr. CARLSON. If we should pass this bill, the limitation would be 2,150,000. At present we have two-million-three-hundred-thousand-odd.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And that would be the ceiling we would have if the Senator's amendment were adopted?

Mr. CARLSON. No. There is no limitation, of course. At present we have some 2,300,000 Federal employees. If we should adopt this provision, not another employee could be hired. We would have to leave vacant every third position. That would work a real hardship.

This provision deals with a subject which should be handled by the Appropriations Committee. It does not belong in the bill, in my opinion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. At present we have no statutory limitation on the number of employees. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is entirely true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under the bill as reported, a statutory limitation of 2,150,000 is set.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is permissive on the part of the President. It is not mandatory.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Kansas proposed to strike the permissive limitation of 2,150,000, and the Senator from South Carolina is agreeable to that procedure.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not object to its being stricken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then let us act upon the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill which we are about to pass provides for an increase of 7½ percent for the classified employees. Is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does it apply to all Federal employees, whether in Washington or elsewhere?

Mr. CARLSON. It does.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is all the bill does?

Mr. CARLSON. That is all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It provides for a 7½-percent increase from January 1, 1958.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question.

Does the figure of 2,300,000 plus represent more employees than we had 2 years ago, more employees than we had 4 years ago, and more Federal employees than we had 5 years ago?

Mr. CARLSON. I have a speech to make on that subject. However, I am glad to give the Senator the figures.

On January 31, 1952, there were 2,530,495 Federal employees.

On January 31, 1953, there were 2,640,000 Federal employees.

On January 31, 1954, there were 2,425,182 Federal employees.

On January 31, 1955, there were 2,366,536 Federal employees.

On January 31, 1956, there were 2,360,184 Federal employees.

1958

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

2747

On January 31, 1957, there were 2,401,320 Federal employees.

There has been a substantial reduction in the number of Federal employees in the past 5 years, based upon these figures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me complete my inquiry.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not wish to make a speech on the subject.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have just been reading a book called Parkinson's Law. I recommend it to Senators.

I know that the Senator from Kansas will inform the Senate fully on this subject later. However, it seems to me that Federal employment has remained at pretty much the same level, between 2,300,000 and 2,500,000, over the past 5 years, varying back and forth. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. CARLSON. That is a fair statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To say that there has been a substantial reduction over a period of years is not quite correct, is it?

Mr. CARLSON. I assume so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What about temporary employees?

Mr. CARLSON. I cannot give any information with respect to temporary employees. These figures relate to classified employees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. From the figures the Senator read, I suggest that the number has been pretty much the same. do not intend to go into the merits of the question, but I think the public ought to know the facts. There has been much loose talk—not by the Senator from Kansas, and not so much in the United States Senate, but around the country—about cutting the Federal payrolls. We hear such talk at certain times of the year.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the Senate has a very high regard for the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. He is chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. I have before me the last statement released by him, dated February 1, 1958. Let me give the figures for the past 6 months.

Mr. President, I ask that this statement be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, IN CONNECTION WITH THE MONTHLY REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY FOR DECEMBER 1957

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of December totaling 2,324,569. This was a net decrease of 5,538 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of November.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1958, which began July 1, 1957, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July.....	2,407,651	6,337	
August.....	2,400,082		7,569
September.....	2,366,398		33,684
October.....	2,339,994		26,404
November.....	2,330,107		9,887
December.....	2,324,569		5,538
Net decrease for 6 months of fiscal year 1958.....			76,745

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies during the month of December was 1,239,168, an increase of 1,652 as compared with the November total of 1,237,516. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in December was 1,085,401, a decrease of 7,190 as compared with 1,092,591 in November.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger decreases were Interior Department with 601, Veterans' Administration with 387, and Agriculture Department with 385. The largest increase was reported by the Post Office Department with 3,560.

Decreases in civilian employment in the Department of Defense were reported by the Department of the Army with 3,885, the Department of the Navy with 1,827, and the Department of the Air Force with 1,487.

Inside continental United States civilian employment decreased 4,856 and outside continental United States civilian employment decreased 682. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in December totaled 565,753, a decrease of 2,909.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies, as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,324,569 civilian employees certified to the committee by the Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in United States Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 232,523 foreign nationals working for the United States military agencies during December who were not counted in the usual personnel report. The number in November was 236,303. The breakdown of this employment for December follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Belgium.....	5			5
Denmark.....	1			1
England.....	5,577		36	5,541
France.....	23,027	16,330		6,697
French Morocco.....	5,184	87	907	4,190
Germany.....	87,746	74,040	371	13,335
Japan.....	105,550	52,563	18,111	34,876
Korea.....	4,758	4,758		
Malta.....	93		93	
Netherlands.....	40			40
Norway.....	25			25
Trinidad.....	517		517	
Total.....	232,523	147,778	20,035	64,710

Mr. CARLSON. Employment last July was 2,407,651. The increase for that month was 6,337.

In August, employment was 2,400,082, a decrease of 7,569.

In September, employment was 2,366,398, a decrease of 33,684.

In October, employment was 2,339,994, a decrease of 26,404.

In November, employment was 2,330,107, a decrease of 9,887.

In December, employment was 2,324,569, a decrease of 5,538.

The net decrease for 6 months of the fiscal year 1958 was 76,745.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Apparently some progress has been made during the past 6 months.

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. However, I point out that since 1952 the situation has been pretty much the same, the number varying from 2,350,000-plus, to 2,450,000-plus.

Mr. ALLOTT. What were the figures for 1952?

Mr. CARLSON. The figure for 1952 was 2,530,495; and for January 31, 1957, 2,401,322. The Senator is not far from correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was the 1952 figure for December, or for the year as a whole?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the committee could furnish the number of temporary employees?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is what the Senator from Illinois was trying to approach. I was trying to find out to what month the figure of 2,530,495 employees applied.

Mr. CARLSON. On January 31, 1952, there was a total of 2,530,495 Government employees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator Yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does this figure include all Government employees, including so-called blue-collar employees, as well as white-collar employees? Is it not true that the decrease is largely in the field of the blue-collar employees, rather than in the field of the white-collar employees? This point is very significant because it deals with the question of Government armories, and contract work. This is a very significant point.

Mr. CARLSON. Let me read from the statement of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. I think it explains fully what he has in mind. He has all the figures, including the figures for foreign personnel, and classified workers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does that refer to blue collar workers, hourly workers, and classified workers?

Mr. CARLSON. I assume that these are the figures the Senator has in mind. Decreases in civilian employees in the Department of Defense were reported as follows. By the Department of the Army, 3,885; Department of the Navy, 1,827; the Department of the Air Force, 1,487. That is what the Senator had in mind, I believe.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is merely for 1 month. If the Senator from Kansas, with his customary accuracy, goes back over the past 5 years, I believe he will find that such reductions as have been effected have been in the field of hourly employees working in the Department of Defense, in the shipyards, and in the armories. So far as the white collar employees are concerned—the bureaucracy, that is—I believe he will find that they have multiplied.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The figures show that there has been a marked decrease in the blue collar defense workers in all three branches. There has been an increase in the white collar workers throughout the entire Government. Whatever reductions have been made have been made in connection with manual workers for defense, primarily work that has been done in Government-maintained plants, air depots, arsenals, and so forth, and is work which was given to General Motors, General Electric, Pratt & Whitney, and other organizations of private enterprise. No saving has been made. More money has been spent in higher wages and invested capital than we have saved by reducing the number of the blue collar workers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is extremely important. I hope the Senator from Kansas will give us figures showing the number of classified workers by years from 1952 on.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the figures would be very revealing if we were to take only one department of the Government. I wonder whether the Senator has figures for the Department of Agriculture. I mention that Department because when Mr. Benson became the Secretary of Agriculture, he reminded the country that he was going to cut down on the unnecessary employees, as he put it, in the Department, and reduce personnel. It is my understanding that the number of employees has gone up about 20 percent, the same percent that farmers have come off the farms. Does the Senator have any figures on Mr. Benson's recruitment program for additional employees?

Mr. CARLSON. No. However, I should like to read a statement into the Record.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will supplement the Record with those figures on Monday.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to read these figures.

This morning the Civil Service Commission furnished me with the following figures. It will be noted that they include Federal employment in all areas in all branches of Government, including legislative employees. The Civil Service Commission compiled this statistical table to cover the period from January 31, 1953, up to and including November 30, 1957, which includes the period of time of the present administration.

January 31, 1953, 2,649,441.

January 31, 1954, 2,425,182.

January 31, 1955, 2,366,539.

January 31, 1956, 2,360,184.

January 31, 1957, 2,401,322.

November 30, 1957—these are the last figures that have been compiled—2,344,804. Therefore, there has been a reduction of more than 300,000 since 1953. These are the classified workers, including those in the legislative branch.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an amplifying question?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The pending bill, the Johnston bill, reported by the committee, is retroactive for classified workers, the same as the amendment we adopted for the postal workers, and that retroactive date is January 1 of this year; is that correct?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. So that by voting for this bill we will be voting retroactivity for the classified workers, just as we voted it for the postal workers.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think we should do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] to strike out section 12 of the committee and substitute the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, between lines 2 and 3, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

SEC. 16. It is the sense of the Congress that appropriations for cooperative agricultural extension work and appropriations for payments to State agricultural experiment stations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, should include additional amounts sufficient to provide increases in the portion of the compensation of persons employed in such work or by such stations, which is paid from such appropriations, corresponding to the increases provided for employees under this act.

On page 26, line 3, strike out "section 16" and insert "section 17."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield briefly to the junior Senator from Oregon, who has been seeking recognition to make a brief statement?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee which reported S. 734, I have prepared a rather extensive statement, analyzing the bill and explaining very fully the reasons for its passage. At this late hour I will merely ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Record at this point rather than being read in detail.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

The legislative situation in regard to S. 734 is the same as in the case of S. 27, the bill to increase the pay of postal employees. It has been on the Senate Calendar since last year. Its provisions are well understood. The reasons why it should be enacted are well known.

In these circumstances, I will confine my remarks to an explanation of the substantive changes made by the committee amendment and at the same time show how they dove-

tail with other features of the bill and the overall Federal pay pattern.

PAY INCREASE

With but minor exceptions, the bill provides an across-the-board increase of 7½ percent to all employees whose pay is fixed under the Classification Act, or is related thereto. Accordingly, the increase will apply to some 975,000 employees directly subject to the Classification Act; some 19,700 employees in the Division of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration; approximately 12,500 employees in the Foreign Service and related functions of the Department of State; employees in agencies such as the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority whose rates of pay are fixed by administrative action; employees in the judicial branch; and legislative employees.

The coverage of the bill follows exactly the pattern established in other years.

The exceptions to the fixed percentage across-the-board increase are:

1. Top pay: The reported bill would not increase the existing \$16,000, GS-18, salary ceiling. The committee amendment raises the ceiling of grade GS-18 to \$17,500. That action made necessary minor adjustments in grade GS-13 and up in order to maintain a proper relationship between the pay rates of the higher grades of the pay schedule.

I anticipate some will wonder why that action was taken. Last year, when the bill was reported, the administration took a flat stand against an increase of any kind. This year, the administration recommended an increase with a further adjustment in the top grades, to provide a range of \$18,000 to \$19,500 in grade GS-18. The committee amendment recognizes the administration request but does not go the full distance. The \$17,500 ceiling was believed to be an adequate and realistic figure at this time. There have been many unofficial expressions of approval from the administration of the committee action. In fact, it has been indicated that the pay pattern in the committee amendment is an improvement over the administration plan.

The adjustment in the upper grades of the Classification Act, amounting to something in excess of 7½ percent, is reflected in comparable pay levels clear across the Federal service except in the case of top legislative employees now receiving comparable rates of pay. In their case, they will not be given the adjusted increase but are limited to the flat 7½-percent increase and left subject to the old \$16,000 ceiling. That was done to avoid any possible conflict that might serve to delay the bill. However, it is a matter that should be looked into and adjusted equitably at the earliest possible time. It is my belief, and certainly it was the belief of the majority of the committee that the top employees in the legislative branch are worth every bit as much as their counterparts in the other branches of the Government, and should receive equal treatment. I hope early attention will be given the matter for I do not think it proper that the disparity in salaries be allowed to exist for any considerable period of time.

2. Commission authorized increases: Section 803 of the Classification Act authorizes the Civil Service Commission to recruit and pay employees at any rate of the appropriate grade when a sufficient shortage of qualified personnel for the type of work involved is found to exist. Since the President vetoed the pay bills last year, the Commission has exercised its authority under section 803 with increased frequency in order to attract and retain skilled personnel, particularly in the engineering and scientific fields.

The actions of the Commission, while perfectly proper and certainly justified, have created somewhat of a problem. Let me outline the problem and explain how the committee amendment treats it,

Take, for example, a GS-7 engineer in the Federal service for something over a year. He would be at the second step of the grade, which carries a salary of \$4,660. As a result of the Commission action, pursuant to section 803, he and all other engineers in grade 7 are raised to the top step of the grade and, hence, receives a salary of \$5,335. Proportionately, his increase is greater than an employee who has been in the service longer and is in step 3. Likewise, the employee in step 3 receives a proportionately greater increase than the employee in step 4 and so on up to the point that the longtime employee at the top of grade received nothing at all.

S. 734 raises the bottom step of grade 7 from \$4,600 to \$4,865 and the top step from \$5,335 to \$5,735. Now then, S. 734 provides that such shall receive (1) his old rate as increased, or (2) his present salary, whichever is the greater. In the example cited, the employee would continue to receive his present salary of \$5,335 because it is greater than his old rate as increased to \$4,865. However, the bill then goes on to provide that such employee may, upon approval by the Commission, be given a salary at a step not in excess of the new salary for the step of the grade he now is in because of the 803 action. Thus, he could be paid at any rate up to \$5,735, the salary for the top step of his grade. The sum and substance of the situation is that the committee believed that, as the action was taken by the Commission in the first instance, it should have full authority under the bill to adjust the pay of such employees as might be equitable so long as the employee is assured of a salary not less than he is currently receiving or he would receive after the bill is enacted, had not the 803 action occurred.

The committee amendment accepts fully a further recommendation of the administration. The administration, after long study and in the light of current conditions, recommended that the Classification Act be amended to permit the entry into the Federal service of certain types of highly qualified personnel, such as engineers and scientific personnel at grade 7 instead of grade 5. The committee amendment carries out this recommendation completely.

The administration recommended further that the ceiling be removed on the number of supergrades and the number of scientific positions under Public Law 313 that might be established. The committee amendment does not go that far. It does, however, authorize the full and exact number of such positions the administration said were needed now and in the immediate future. I think there can be no disagreement as to the committee's fairness in this matter.

The committee amendment makes one other substantive change in the reported bill. It makes the increases effective with the first pay period commencing on or after January 1, instead of following the date of enactment. The action in this instance is consistent with the postal pay bill.

Other changes made by the amendment are of a technical nature necessary and customary in a bill having a past rather than a future date.

I think the record should show that the cost of S. 734 exceeds the cost of the administration bill by only \$40 million. This is relatively small in terms of the total Federal budget. That difference amounts to less than 75 cents per week per employee. The difference is not enough to be of concern to Wall Street.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to say that I have an amendment to offer on behalf of myself and the Senator from Alabama. It will not be a controversial amendment. I trust it will be accepted. I wonder if the Senator would like to go ahead or permit me to offer my amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. I would not object to it, but I understand that my amendment is not controversial either. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking out, after "July 1, 1958," the words "and subsequent fiscal years."

The effect of that modification is to make the amendment apply only to the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958.

I have conferred with the Senators who are interested in the amendment, and my impression is that the modification meets their objections. The record has already been made on the amendment. An explanation was made a few moments ago. The purpose, as was stated, is not to preclude the Appropriations Committee from doing anything; it is merely an expression of the sense of Congress with reference to these poorly paid extension workers and experiment station workers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To expedite matters, and in order to get the bill passed, I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Mississippi by his amendment as modified, corrects the one point to which I objected and to which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] objected.

He is not attempting to memorialize or bind or influence other Congresses; all he is attempting to do is to say what the present Congress feels the Appropriations Committee should consider this year.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The amendment will apply only for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, as stated, and it is the hope of the author of the amendment that thereby the question will be brought to a head and will be worked out by the Committee on Appropriations with the extension service in the different States, and thereby progress will be made on this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Conversation will cease. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, earlier I expressed my disapproval of this approach. To me it is the height of fancy for the Senate formally to memorialize one of its committees to make more money available, when every Senator can come before the Appropriations Committee and present his case. However, since the amendment has been modified to apply only to the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1958, I shall not oppose the amendment, although I want the Record to show that I still think it is bad practice legislatively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and myself, I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(e) Section 208 (g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 210 (g)), is amended by striking out "60 positions" and inserting in lieu thereof "85 positions, of which not less than 73 shall be for the National Institutes of Health."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the amendment authorizes additional positions in the supergrades for the Public Health Service, particularly in the National Institutes of Health. This is where the basic research is being done in the fields of heart, cancer, and other diseases which afflict the human race. Difficulty is being encountered in keeping very able doctors on the Institutes' staff at low salaries.

The matter has been discussed with Dr. James A. Shannon, the Director of the National Institutes of Health. Also, I have had correspondence with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The matter has been discussed with the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service [Mr. JOHNSTON] and also with the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment is agreeable to the chairman of the committee and to the ranking minority member.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think this is a very worthy amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the amendment in the third degree or the second degree? I could not tell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is in the second degree.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, is it subject to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is open to amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have an amendment. I shall not offer it for the moment, but I shall raise a question. If it is proposed to start raising grades, then I shall propose to raise some grades in the Department of Justice, because in that Department there are supervising attorneys who are in the same grade as attorneys who work in the field. I think this is a matter which ought to have the attention of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

If it is the intention of the Senator from Oregon to insist on his amendment, I shall offer my amendment in addition to it.

If we are going to chop at the bill tonight, I do not know what the ultimate result will be.

Even though the officials of the Public Health Service say the amendment of the Senator from Oregon is necessary, I think such proposals ought to be the subject of a hearing, just as I think the amendment I have ought to be the subject of a hearing. But I shall not press my amendment if the Senator from Oregon will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. As the chairman of the subcommittee which held hearings on the bill, I may say that after the bill was reported, I was importuned by

the representatives of a number of Government departments. However, when I was told that the doctors who are working in the fields of cancer and heart disease and blindness for \$10,000 or \$11,000 a year have been offered pay of \$50,000 a year in private practice or in consultative work, it seemed to me that the subject of their pay was one of prime and urgent importance.

I rejected, for the present, the requests of other departments, including departments in which I am vitally interested as affecting the region from which I come; but it seemed to me that National Institutes of Health should certainly take first priority if any additions were made to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is a part of the general problem. Every agency and department of the Government is faced with the same problem. If we are going into the question of supergrades, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and other departments also have problems of a similar nature.

I dislike very much to see this matter pressed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator will find that about 400 such cases have already been included in the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Where are the 400?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They are included in the bill. Representatives of those departments came before the committee this year. They include some which were placed in the bill today.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are asking for some supergrades to iron out inequities.

I have called attention to the matter. I shall not delay the passage of the bill. I think it is poor practice to come forward with amendments at this hour, when the whole matter ought to have been consolidated in a single bill. Still, the Committee on Appropriations will not have to allow the money if it does not want to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I dislike to be put in this position. I should like to see every department treated equally and equitably.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is what the committee is trying to do. The other departments are included in the bill; the National Institutes of Health is not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Department of Justice, with respect to the supergrades and advisory positions, is not.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can tell the Senator that they are included in the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then why in the world did they call me and ask to be included?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, for himself and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record, a statement

I have prepared concerning the amendment just agreed to.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

I am particularly happy to be associated with Senator HILL in sponsoring this amendment. The amendment authorizes the establishment of 25 positions for research and scientific purposes in the National Institutes of Health. These positions are necessary if they are to continue the fine work they are now doing. This small number of positions constitutes the bare minimum required now and in the immediate future to carry out plans and programs underway or authorized.

Due to a series of unfortunate circumstances, the need for these positions was not fully developed or realized at the time the bill was under consideration by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Had this not been the case, I am confident they would have been provided for in the bill now on the calendar.

Today, when we are spending such vast sums for destruction or protection against destruction of human lives, I think we can well afford the expenditure of such a relatively small amount in the interest of finding ways of ending disease and human suffering. This is an urgent matter.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I think the Senate is about ready to act on the passage of the classified pay bill. After the bill has passed the Senate, it will go to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, where it will receive careful consideration. Then it will be necessary to have House approval. Possibly a conference will be held on it.

I say to the classified workers, as I said to the postal employees when I expressed my position on the postal pay bill this afternoon, that I hope it will be possible to get a substantial increase for them. Whatever is done for the postal workers, I want to have done for the classified workers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has made all reasonable efforts to be on the floor for the debate and vote dealing with the proposed pay increase for postal employees. Unfortunately, important commitments in his State have made it impossible for him to be here. He has asked that I have printed in the Record the following brief statement of his views on this question:

Pay increases for these essential public servants have been long overdue.

One cannot measure with any degree of precision the substantial worth of the services they perform, but it can be said, without any doubt, that the rising cost of living alone justifies a significant increase in their take-home pay.

If this, the most productive country in history, cannot carry out so clear-cut an obligation to its own employees, there is question as to its sense of responsibility in other obligations.

In the State of Missouri, we are experiencing a farm recession and an industrial recession. Regardless of their primary causes, their effects are interrelated and the people generally suffer.

Today, with the declining value of the dollar, our postal employees are actually receiving less purchasing power than they received last year or the year before.

It is, therefore, my hope that the Congress will act responsibly and that the administration will implement fully congressional ac-

tion to increase the salaries of these dedicated people who serve the public so well.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I have a very brief statement I should like to make before the vote is taken.

When I addressed the Senate on Wednesday on the postal rate bill, I noted that the form of the amendments or the questions to be voted on might not fairly reflect my real views.

That is what happened, I stated that I was against raising the first-class mail rate from the current 3 cents. Yet the manner in which the issue was presented gave me a choice of voting for a raise to either 4 cents or 5 cents.

Since I had no opportunity to vote to leave the 3-cent level unchanged, I simply voted "present."

Also in my Wednesday remarks I expressed my opposition to linking the postal employees pay bill to the postal rate bill.

Now I have been forced to decide whether to vote against the much-deserved pay increase for our postal employees, or to continue to express my opposition to the postal rate bill.

To be consistent I should have voted against this entire package so as to show my feeling that the American people should not be saddled with the 5-cent stamp for first-class postage.

However, I did not wish to penalize the loyal postal employees for the mistakes I feel have been made on this floor.

Therefore, I voted "yea" on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee substitute, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 734) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is the question on the passage of the combined bills?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The question is on the passage of the classified pay bill.

The bill (S. 734) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.